

UNIV. OF
TORONTO
LIBRARY



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

7/11/15
I

THE SOUTHWESTERN HISTORICAL QUARTERLY

VOLUME XVII

JULY, 1913, TO APRIL, 1914

EDITORS:

EUGENE C. BARKER,

HERBERT E. BOLTON.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

CHAS. W. RAMSDELL,

E. W. WINKLER,

EDGAR L. HEWETT.

MANAGING EDITOR:

EUGENE C. BARKER.

136321
141511

THE TEXAS STATE HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

AUSTIN, TEXAS

1914

F
381
565
v. 17

711

The Texas State Historical Association

Organized 1897

PRESIDENT:

Z. T. FULMORE.

VICE-PRESIDENTS:

MISS KATIE DAFFAN,
MRS. ADELE B. LOOSCAN,

BEAUREGARD BRYAN,
R. C. CRANE.

RECORDING SECRETARY AND LIBRARIAN:

EUGENE C. BARKER.

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY AND TREASURER:

CHARLES W. RAMSDELL.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL:

Z. T. FULMORE,
KATIE DAFFAN,
BEAUREGARD BRYAN,
EDWARD W. HEUSINGER,
ADELE B. LOOSCAN,
EUGENE C. BARKER,
CHARLES W. RAMSDELL,
E. W. WINKLER,

JOHN C. TOWNES,
W. F. MCCAULEY,
LILIA M. CASIS,
S. A. MOORE,
S. P. BROOKS,
BRIDE NEILL TAYLOR,
DORA FOWLER ARTHUR,
W. J. BATTLE.

PUBLICATION COMMITTEE:

EUGENE C. BARKER,
HERBERT E. BOLTON,

Z. T. FULMORE,

E. W. WINKLER,
W. J. BATTLE.

TV

CONTENTS

NUMBER 1; JULY, 1913

THE LOUISIANA-TEXAS FRONTIER, II.....	Isaac Joslin Cox..	1
DIARY OF W. Y. ALLEN, 1838-1839.....	William S. Red, Editor..	43
NEW LIGHT ON MANUEL LISA AND THE SPANISH FUR TRADE.....		
.....	Herbert E. Bolton..	61
BRITISH CORRESPONDENCE CONCERNING TEXAS, VII.....		
.....	Ephraim D. Adams, Editor..	67
BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES: Woodburn, THE LIFE OF THADDEUS STEPHEN: Early, LIEUTENANT-GENERAL JUBAL ANDERSON EARLY; Broun, DR. WILLIAM LEROY BROUN.....		93
NEWS ITEMS		99

NUMBER 2; OCTOBER, 1913

THE MOVEMENT FOR STATE DIVISION IN CALIFORNIA, 1849-1860.....		
.....	William H. Ellison..	101
THE LOUISIANA-TEXAS FRONTIER, II (Continued).....	Isaac Joslin Cox..	140
BRITISH CORRESPONDENCE CONCERNING TEXAS, VIII.....		
.....	Ephraim D. Adams, Editor..	188
BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES: Coman, ECONOMIC BEGINNINGS OF THE FAR WEST; Tiling, THE GERMAN ELEMENT IN TEXAS, 1820- 1850		207
NEWS ITEMS		215

NUMBER 3; JANUARY, 1914

TEXAS AND THE BOUNDARY ISSUE, 1822-1829.....	William R. Manning..	217
PENNSYLVANIA AND THE INDEPENDENCE OF TEXAS.....		
.....	James E. Winston..	262
ALLEN'S REMINISCENCES OF TEXAS, 1838-1842.....		
.....	William S. Red, Editor..	283
BRITISH CORRESPONDENCE CONCERNING TEXAS, IX.....		
.....	Ephraim D. Adams, Editor..	306
BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES: Smith, THE VICEROY OF NEW SPAIN; Wilson, John Brown, Soldier of Fortune: A CRITIQUE; L'AMERIQUE LATINE. REPUBLIQUE ARGENTINE.....		315
NEWS ITEMS		321

NUMBER 4; APRIL, 1914

THE FOUNDING OF THE MISSIONS ON THE SAN GABRIEL RIVER, 1745- 1749.....	Herbert E. Bolton..	323
THE APACHE MISSION ON THE SAN SABA RIVER.....		
.....	William Edward Dunn..	379
BRITISH CORRESPONDENCE CONCERNING TEXAS, X.....		
.....	Ephraim D. Adams, Editor..	415
BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES: Phillips, LIFE OF ROBERT TOOMBS.....		428
NEWS ITEMS		430
AFFAIRS OF THE ASSOCIATION.....		432

704

FELLOWS AND LIFE MEMBERS

OF THE

ASSOCIATION

The constitution of the Association provides that "Members who show, by published work, special aptitude for historical investigation may become Fellows. Thirteen Fellows shall be elected by the Association when first organized, and the body thus created may thereafter elect additional Fellows on the nomination of the Executive Council. The number of Fellows shall never exceed fifty."

The present list of Fellows is as follows:

BARKER, PROF. EUGENE C.	KLEBERG, JUDGE RUDOLPH, JR.
BATTS, JUDGE R. L.	LOOSCAN, MRS. ADELE B.
BOLTON, PROF. HERBERT EUGENE	MC CALEB, DR. W. F.
CASIS, PROF. LILIA M.	MILLER, DR. E. T.
CLARK, PROF. ROBERT CARLTON	NEU, MR. C. T.
COOPER, PRESIDENT O. H.	PENNYBACKER, MRS. PERCY V.
COX, PROF. I. J.	RAMSDELL, DR. CHAS. W.
DUNN, MR. WILLIAM EDWARD	RATHER, DR. ETHEL ZIVLEY
ESTILL, PROF. H. F.	SHEPARD, JUDGE SETH
FULMORE, JUDGE Z. T.	SMITH, PROF. W. ROY
GAINES, JUDGE R. R.	TOWNES, PROF. JOHN C.
HACKETT, MR. CHAS. W.	WEST, MISS ELIZABETH H.
HATCHER, MRS. MATTIE AUSTIN	WILLIAMS, JUDGE O. W.
HOUSTON, HON. D. F.	WINKLER, MR. ERNEST WM.
	WORLEY, MR. J. L.

The constitution provides also that "Such benefactors of the Association as shall pay into its treasury at any one time the sum of thirty dollars, or shall present to the Association an equivalent in books, MSS., or other acceptable matter, shall be classed as Life Members."

The Life Members at present are:

ALLEN, MR. WILBUR P.	LITTLEFIELD, MAJOR GEORGE W.
AUTRY, MR. JAMES L.	McFADDEN, MR. W. P. H.
AYER, MR. EDWARD EVERETT	MINOR, MR. F. D.
BAKER, MR. R. H.	MOODY, MR. W. L.
BRACKENRIDGE, HON. GEO. W.	MOREHEAD, MR. C. R.
BUNDY, MR. Z. T.	NEALE, MR. WM. J.
COCHRANE, MR. SAM P.	PARKER, MRS. EDWARD W.
COUCHESNE, MR. A.	PEARCE, MR. J. E.
CRANE, MR. R. C.	RICE, MR. J. S.
DAVIDSON, MR. W. S.	RICE, HON. W. M.
DEALEY, MR. GEORGE B.	ROTAN, MRS. EDWARD
DILWORTH, MR. THOS. G.	RUGELEY, MR. HENRY
DONALDSON, MRS. NANA	SCHMIDT, MR. JOHN
SMITHWICK	SCHREINER, MR. CHARLES
GILBERT, MR. JOHN N.	SEVIER, MRS. CLARA D.
GUNNELL, MR. W. N.	STARK, MR. H. J. L.
HANRICK, MR. R. A.	TERRY, MR. WHARTON
HEFLEY, MR. W. T.	TODD, MR. CHARLES S.
HOGG, MR. WILL C.	VAN ZANDT, MAJ. K. M.
HOUSE, MR. E. M.	WALKER, MR. J. A.
HYDE, MR. JAMES H.	WASHER, MR. NAT M.
JONES, MR. ROLAND	WEBB, MR. MACK
KENEDY, MR. JNO. G.	WILLACY, HON. JOHN G.
KIRBY, MR. JNO. H.	WILLIAMS, JUDGE O. W.

THE SOUTHWESTERN HISTORICAL QUARTERLY

Vol. XVII.*

JULY, 1913

No. 1

The publication committee and the editors disclaim responsibility for views expressed by contributors to THE QUARTERLY.

THE LOUISIANA-TEXAS FRONTIER

II

ISAAC JOSLIN COX

PART II—THE AMERICAN OCCUPATION OF THE LOUISIANA-TEXAS FRONTIER¹

INTRODUCTION

The present article is a continuation of that appearing in THE QUARTERLY for July, 1906. In the former article the writer discussed conditions during the period before 1803, when such events as affected the Louisiana-Texas Frontier prior to 1762 concerned the local colonial policy of French officials in Louisiana or Spanish officials in Texas; and after that date, Spanish officials in both jurisdictions. Aside from strictly local affairs, the most significant question that appealed to all these officials arose from the fear inspired by Anglo-American expansion to the westward. This fear exhibited before 1803 may now be interpreted as a premonition of what actually happened after that date. The significant problem before the Spanish officials of the Interior Provinces and the Mexican Viceroyalty was how best to meet the threatened tide of American invasion. This problem concerned not merely the districts above mentioned, but the Floridas, Cuba, California, and other regions intimately or remotely connected with the Gulf of Mexico and the Northwest coast of America.

¹Part I of this study appeared in THE QUARTERLY, X, 1-75.

*Volume I-XV published as THE QUARTERLY of the Texas State Historical Association.

From the standpoint of the American government the problem was a two-fold one: First, to secure New Orleans and the western bank of the Mississippi, thus gaining an unquestioned right to navigate that stream in its entirety; and second, to round out their dominions to the south and to the west so as to secure easily defensible frontiers limited by well-defined natural barriers. From the standpoint of the Louisiana-Texas Frontier, the region under consideration, this problem involved the definite occupation of the lower courses of the Red, the Arkansas, and the Missouri, as a basis for a later possible expansion to the Rocky Mountains and the Rio Grande. Thus for the years immediately following 1803 our treatment of the subject falls naturally into two divisions which we may term "The American Occupation of the Louisiana-Texas Frontier" and "The First Attempt to Expand the Louisiana-Texas Frontier." The following chapters will fall under the first division.

At this point it may be well to refer to a brief article that I have already published under the title, "The Significance of the Louisiana-Texas Frontier," in the *Third Annual Report* of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association. In accordance with the method there suggested for treating this frontier, the present study, dealing with the American occupation, is included within "The Period of Delimitation," which extends from about 1760 to 1821. This somewhat arbitrary division begins at the time when the first definite suggestion appeared to make the Sabine the boundary between French Louisiana and Spanish Texas and ends at the date when that river was finally accepted as part of our southwestern territorial limit. Naturally the most important phases of this question occur after 1803. A sufficient indication of this is the fact that as much space is occupied in describing conditions for the two years following the transfer of Louisiana to the United States, as in the whole of the preceding period. Most of the remaining years to 1821 call for a similar detailed treatment and the same is true for the quarter century to 1846, when the line that finally delimited the Louisiana-Texas Frontier, after more than a century of controversy, was gradually overrun and demolished by the tide of westward migration that it had not been able to arrest. Thus ended the history of this important frontier, which substantially includes the history of the region between the Missouri, the lower

Mississippi, the Rio Grande, and the Rockies, and which in intensity and variety of interest surpasses all other frontier areas in America.

As an introduction to the present article I desire to indicate briefly the various chapter divisions with some suggestion of their bearing upon the subject as a whole. Naturally American officials were first interested in the question of Louisiana boundaries, and although the western, like the northern boundary of Louisiana, was originally regarded as of less importance than that bordering West Florida, it acquired significance with the increase in geographical knowledge of the West as a whole, and especially with the opening of relations with the Mexican revolutionists. All early American attempts to define the limits of Louisiana were little better than surmises, generally assumed for the purpose of diplomatic trading. The Spaniard possessed greater opportunities for acquiring information in regard to this important subject, but in the beginning his knowledge was hardly more accurate than his opponent's.

With the occupation of such frontier posts as the Spaniards yielded in 1804, the Americans undertook the task of establishing upon a new basis their border relations with their neighbors. This included such minor tasks as regulating general intercourse between the white settlers, watching changes in the frontier garrisons, and considering the status of escaping slaves. Only the last named aroused a serious controversy and thus foreshadowed a more bitter domestic struggle growing out of the presence of slavery in this region. In addition to these minor affairs two series of problems stand out with greater prominence. The question of exploring expeditions along the disputed frontier caused considerable diplomatic activity as well as serious local concern, while both government official and private individual on either side strained every point to gain the allegiance of the Indians. In the early stages of this latter effort the ultimate outcome seemed extremely problematical. Later developments turned the scale in favor of the Americans, but their hardly-won victory made necessary the crushing of desired allies as well as the circumventing of Spanish efforts. This result, however, was not achieved until long after the Spaniard and his Mexican successor had lost control of the area involved.

While conditions on the distant frontier stirred up local problems that speedily acquired national importance, these same problems, because of our peculiar relations with France, England, and Spain, after 1803 likewise acquired an international significance. They emphasize in a minor way our diplomatic subserviency to France, and in a more limited degree, to England, at a time when our government attempted to bully Spain out of territory that it rightfully controlled. To us it seems inevitable that the United States had to possess the greater part of the Floridas and Texas—the areas in controversy—but it is regrettable that this acquisition was accompanied by a policy of truckling to Napoleon and hectoring Spain, while employing numerous methods of legislative and popular *chicane* to conceal its true purpose. In the present instalment we do not touch the lowest depths of this transaction. Monroe at Aranjuez and Madison in Washington represented a nerveless attempt at independent negotiations rather than the shameless but secret subservience that characterizes the later policy of their responsible superior, Jefferson. But even while fruitlessly striving for an uncertain freedom in action, they suggested the unconditional surrender of Napoleon's behest that marks the next stage of their Louisiana diplomacy. At this period Texas is subordinate to West Florida, but one may note the general features of the controversy that is later to rage over its possession. By midsummer of 1805, then, the stage was fully set in Europe and in America for the combined diplomatic and frontier drama that marks the next four decades of our territorial history.

Some description of the sources employed in this study may not be inappropriate. In the first place I have made a careful examination of the various repositories in Washington that are open to the historical student. The most important single documentary source there consists of the six manuscript volumes of the *Claiborne Correspondence*, deposited in the Bureau of Rolls and Library at the State Department. The separate documents of these volumes have been catalogued by Mr. David W. Parker in the *Calendar of Papers in Washington Archives relating to the Territories of the United States*. In my footnotes I have used the numbers of Mr. Parker's *Calendar*, both to save space and to afford those interested a ready opportunity to trace the sources. In addition to the *Claiborne Correspondence* I have made use of various

other sources in Washington, which are indicated definitely in the footnotes and may be studied more in detail in Van Tyne and Leland's *Guide to the Archives of the Government of the United States in Washington*.

Outside of Washington the "Letters to and from Monroe" in the Lenox Branch of the New York Public Library, the "Wilkinson Papers" in the Chicago Historical Society, and the "Sibley Letters" in the Missouri Historical Society afford valuable supplementary material in English. The Spanish transcripts in the last mentioned repository, among *Adams Transcripts* in the State Department at Washington, and especially those in the Mississippi State Department of Archives and History have been still more valuable than the sources available in English. As in the case of Mr. Parker's *Calendar* I have used in my footnotes the numbers given by Mr. James Alexander Robertson in his *List of Documents in Spanish Archives . . . of which Transcripts are preserved in American Libraries*.

In addition to these transcripts I have recently had the opportunity to examine the originals and to obtain additional data from the Mexican and Spanish repositories, from the French and English diplomatic archives, and from the *Bexar Archives* and the archives of the State Library, in Austin, Texas. While most of the material thus collected refers to another period than the two years comprised in the present study, the opportunity to verify data obtained from the transcripts by personally examining the originals or copies from which the transcripts were made, has not been valueless for this work. A specific instance is shown in the Wilkinson affair mentioned in Chapter II.

At the same time, as one encounters in the different repositories in Mexico City, in Seville, and in Madrid, not to mention those of minor cities, an almost endless number of copies of the same communication directed by different conveyances to the same officials or to other officials interested in the same subject, he realizes as never before the necessity for some sort of calendar of documents contained in these various storehouses. Under the circumstances the task of determining the original of a given document or the attempt to note all the variant readings in order to obtain all possible facts, is well nigh hopeless. Still it is possible to obtain much that is new and significant from the Spanish and

Mexican archives, even under present conditions, and the uniform courtesy and intelligence of the officials in charge greatly lighten the stupendous task of searching through them. The description of these repositories as given by Professor Shepherd in his *Guide to the Materials . . . in Spanish Archives* and by Professor Bolton in his forthcoming *Guide to . . . the Mexican Archives* will supplement the brief mention here. My thanks are due to the above pioneer scholars, to the officials in charge of the various collections, and to those connected with the Bureau of Historical Research of the Carnegie Institution for numberless courtesies shown and assistance rendered in obtaining material for this and allied phases of a study of our territorial relations with Spain during the first quarter of the last century.

I. THE WESTERN BOUNDARY OF LOUISIANA

Early in July, 1803, President Jefferson learned definitely of the purchase of Louisiana and immediately took measures to gain information concerning his unforeseen acquisition. His utter ignorance, shared equally by his colleagues, is disclosed in Madison's warning to Monroe not to attempt at that time any arrangement with Spain regarding the western limits of Louisiana.¹ Meanwhile Jefferson took the first steps towards enlightening this ignorance by submitting to certain residents of the lower Mississippi Valley a list of questions relating to the boundaries and general cartography of Louisiana. The resulting correspondence summarizes in a fairly definite manner such knowledge on this subject as was then current in the Southwest.²

Jefferson soon learned from these gentlemen that the cartography of Louisiana was an almost unknown subject, nor could he gain from them any accurate knowledge of its western boundary. None of them, however, favored a claim beyond the Sabine. Claiborne wrote him that he understood that previous to 1763 the French and Spaniards planned to run a boundary line in that

¹*American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, II, 627.

²A general summary of this correspondence with Governor W. C. C. Claiborne of Mississippi Territory, Daniel Clark, Jr., of New Orleans, William Dunbar, of Natchez, and Dr. John Sibley, of Natchitoches, will be found in Cox, I. J., *The Early Exploration of Louisiana*, 36-39, where definite references are given. Cf. also Parker, D. W., *Calendar of Papers Relating to the Territories of the United States*, Nos. 6871-6880.

region and had fixed as its starting point the mouth of that river, which, he naively adds, "disembogues itself into the bay of St. Bernard." Those engaged in running this line had proceeded up the Sabine to a small fort, where they buried some leaden plates in the ground. From this point they carried the line in an uncertain direction until it intersected "a small stream called Bayou Pierre," about five leagues northwest of Natchitoches, where they ceased work.³

Clark approached the boundary question from the other side of the continent, taking as his starting point the limit fixed on the Northwest Coast by the Nootka Sound Convention between Spain and Great Britain. From the uncertain point where Spanish California and New Albion met, there was nothing to define the western boundary of Louisiana, until one reached the "Bayou des Lauriers" [Arroyo Hondo]. At the spot where the road from Natchitoches to Nacogdoches crossed the creek, "about two leagues to the S. W. by S. of Natchitoches on the River Rouge," and five leagues from "Adais," the respective jurisdictions of France and of Spain had been marked by leaden plates bearing the royal arms of each, affixed to convenient trees on each side of the road. From this point there was no indication of the direction which the line took, but similar plates were reported to have been fixed at the Yatasse settlement among the Nandaco Indians, about fifty leagues northwest of Natchitoches. Below the "Bayou des Lauriers" the boundary line was never established, because the French were not willing to allow the Spanish claim that it should run due south and strike the sea near the mouth of the "Carcasou" [Calcasieu]. But for this, he adds, "they [the Spaniards] have no authority and would, I believe, willingly compound to make the Sabinas the frontier."⁴

Dunbar supports Clark's statement regarding the "Bayou des Lauriers" by quoting a letter from a friend, evidently Don José

³Claiborne may have been speaking of a garbled version of the *Representation*, summarized in THE QUARTERLY, X, 24-26.

⁴This interpretation should be compared with the document enclosed in Salcedo's letter to Godoy, December 13, 1803. This is to be found among the *Spanish Transcripts* of the Mississippi State Department of Archives and History and is listed by J. A. Robertson in his *List of Documents in Spanish Archives*, as No. 4934. See also MSS. *Provincias Internas*, Vol. 201, *Archivo General, Mexico, Translacion de una Noticia sobre los Limites entre Nacogdoches y la Louisiana*, Bexar, April 24, 1809.

Martínez, who was engaged upon the Spanish Boundary Commission. He also states that he has a sketch, based upon a Spanish chart, which represents a boundary line as running in an east-north-east direction from the Sabine to a point about two leagues from the Red River, whence making a right angle to include the post of Adaes, it runs in a west-northwest direction for an indefinite extent, but with obvious intention to parallel the Red River. From this sketch he concluded that the United States could claim a line parallel to that stream and prolonged to the "Northern Andes, from which chain of mountains the Red River and the Missouri derive their sources." From that point this watershed should constitute the western boundary of Louisiana, possibly as far as the latitude of the Lake of the Woods. Sibley vaguely mentioned a similar line and likewise reported an agreement between local Spanish officials in Texas and Louisiana, by which the general commandant of the Interior Provinces exercised jurisdiction over the Bayou Pierre Settlement, east of the Sabine. This local agreement, however, in no way affected the territorial rights of the United States.

Aside from certain minor differences it will be seen that these four men in their reports substantially agree that the western boundary of Louisiana is of most indefinite character. Dunbar is the only one to suggest a fairly clear limit—the Continental Divide—which Jefferson also adopted; and this was later commonly accepted. The apparent suggestion by Clark that the western boundary of Louisiana began on the Pacific, is neutralized by his later statement that France had claimed only as far west on the tributaries of the Mississippi as her explorers had penetrated. All of them acknowledged that Spain rightfully exercised jurisdiction east of the Sabine, and Clark expressly scouted any French claim west of that river based on La Salle's Texas settlement. Dunbar quotes, apparently with approval, the opinion of his Spanish correspondent at New Orleans that the United States should cede to Spain the country west of the Mississippi in exchange for the Floridas. Clark hints at the same idea by stating that the boundary question does not depend on exact information, but must be settled by negotiation and compromise.

While awaiting answers from the lower Mississippi Jefferson began to formulate an opinion of his own regarding the limits of Louisiana. In the midst of correspondence regarding the explora-

tion of that province and the constitutionality of its acquisition, he took occasion to express his ideas on its "unquestioned limits." He believed its "exterior boundary" to be formed by the "highlands enclosing the waters of the Mississippi and Missouri," with such terminal points as the "Mexicana [Sabine] or the highlands to the east of it," at one extreme, and at the other, a line drawn "from the Lake of the Woods to the nearest source of the Mississippi."⁵ Passing beyond limits "not admitting of question," Jefferson stated that we had "some pretensions" or "some claims" to the "Rio Norte or Bravo." By the end of August, 1803, he became satisfied that our right as far westward as the "Bay of St. Bernard" might be "strongly maintained," but weakened the force of this statement by suggesting the possibility of compromising "on the western limit," rather than on the Florida border. In the autumn he sent to certain of his correspondents his conclusions on this subject, in the form of a pamphlet, entitled, "The Limits and Bounds of Louisiana."⁶

The importance of this pamphlet lies in the fact that it summarizes the views of Jefferson, which in turn were held by most American officials until 1819. The author mistakenly assumed that by the end of the seventeenth century France had actual possession of the Gulf coast from Mobile to Matagorda Bay, and that this possession entitled them to claim from the Perdido to the Rio Grande. He was ignorant of the effect exerted by the later Spanish occupation of Texas, or else wilfully disregarded it, for he represented New Mexico, and not Texas, as exercising jurisdiction to the Sabine, after 1762. He states that neither the treaty of that year, nor any other, abridged the extensive French claim to the "Bravo." Moreover, this claim was likewise protected by any legitimate interpretation of the word "retrocede" in the third article of the Treaty of San Ildefonso, and by the positive state-

⁵This line was mentioned in the Convention which Rufus King had just negotiated with the British government. The Senate struck out the clause containing this article. For the other references to the subject of Louisiana limits cf. Ford, Paul L., *Writings of Jefferson*, VIII, 242, 261, and *Jefferson Papers* (MSS.), Library of Congress, Series I, Vol. 9, No. 121.

⁶Published in 1904 by Houghton, Mifflin & Co., in *Documents Relating to the Purchase and Exploration of Louisiana*. This brief pamphlet was based on such printed authorities as were then available. As these were mostly French, with vague or misleading statements regarding the limits of Louisiana, the work now has slight value, although its author seemed perfectly satisfied with it.

ment of Laussat to Claiborne and Wilkinson at New Orleans, in December, 1803.⁷

In view of the obscurity in regard to the limits of Louisiana it would seem only the natural thing for Jefferson to ask the French or the Spanish government to define them. But the latter was then protesting against the validity of our title to any part of Louisiana. On the other hand the autocrat of France, who had dictated the terms of the Treaty of San Ildefonso, seems purposely to have made these limits obscure. Otherwise it is difficult to account for the language of its third article: "His Catholic Majesty promises and engages on his part, to retrocede to the French Republic . . . the colony or province of Louisiana, with the same extent that it now has in the hands of Spain, and that it had when France possessed it; and such as it should be after the treaties subsequently entered into between Spain and other states."

When one possesses the power to dictate the terms of a treaty and permits such an indefinite statement to represent the limits of a territory ceded to himself, it must be for some sinister purpose later to be revealed. Spanish authorities believed that Napoleon designed the enigmatical character of this article to afford a later pretext for reviving the pretensions of La Salle and Crozat and overrunning Mexico.⁸ St. Cyr, the French minister at Madrid, confirmed their belief by stating that Spain had conveyed to France the whole of the Gulf coast to the mouth of the Rio Grande.⁹

Napoleon first definitely showed his hand in the instructions issued by Decrès to Victor, November 26, 1802. The latter never had the opportunity to carry them out as captain-general of Louisiana, but Laussat, the prefect, as we have already seen, informed the American commissioners of their contents and thus aroused the protests of Salcedo and Casa Calvo. One should not assign too much emphasis to this French declaration, and cer-

⁷Claiborne and Wilkinson to Madison, December 27, 1803, in *Documents Relating to the Louisiana Cession*, MSS., Bureau of Rolls and Library, Dept. of State. See also *Wilkinson Papers*, II, Wilkinson to Jared Ingersoll, undated. Cf. Parker, D. W., *Calendar of Papers*, etc., No. 6907.

⁸Cf. *Memoir* dated December 23, 1814, in *Papers Relating to Burr's Conspiracy*, Bureau of Rolls and Library, State Department, and also Ogg, F. A., *The Opening of the Mississippi*, 484.

⁹Cf. Sloane, W. M., in *Am. Hist. Rev.*, IV, 447.

tainly should not regard it as giving us a claim to the Pacific. It was a mere order to take military possession of the territory, and seems to have emanated originally from the Department of Foreign Affairs, under the direct inspiration of Napoleon.¹⁰ The great despoiler who was reconstructing the map of Europe would not hesitate to extend his projected colonial sway over Texas to the Rio Grande, especially if this brought him nearer the famed mines of Mexico. He might use even such a poor source as Du Pratz's *Histoire* to bolster his pretensions.

Before the cession of Louisiana to the United States our representatives had on more than one occasion expressed themselves in favor of guaranteeing the Spanish possessions west of the Mississippi in return for the cession of the Floridas and in this they seem to parallel the suggestions of contemporary Spanish officials. Our representative public men had long desired these two Spanish provinces, or at least enough of West Florida to command the entire eastern bank of the Mississippi, but did not consider the possibility of acquiring territory beyond it. Yet both Livingston and Monroe had the sagacity to accept Napoleon's proffer of Louisiana, even if they had to exceed their instructions to do so. They did not lose sight of these instructions, however, but used them in the light of the indefinite Third Article of the Treaty, to extend the limits of their acquisition as far as possible. This meant to claim West Florida to the Perdido, on the east, and to make sure of this region and ultimately of all the Floridas by a supplemental western claim to the Rio Grande. The latter could be relinquished in proportion as Spain showed herself willing to accede to our wishes in regard to the Floridas. This was evidently the chief motive that led Livingston to devise our untenable but fascinatingly puzzling claim to West Florida; that induced the possibly jealous Monroe and the home officials to support him; and that made the Florida problem, for the succeeding decade, the significant frontier question in our territorial history. During this period the western boundary of Louisiana played a distinctly inferior part to the eastern.

In attempting to determine just what they had purchased, Monroe and Livingston found little to guide them aside from Na-

¹⁰Cf. Ficklin, J. R., in *Pubns. of So. Hist. Assn.*, V, 383. Robertson, *Louisiana under the Rule of Spain, France, and the United States, 1785-1807*, II, 141, N. 62.

oleon's cynical declaration that if no obscurity already existed in the treaty, it would perhaps be good policy to put one in; or Talleyrand's more tempting suggestion that the Americans had a good bargain and would doubtless make the best of it. Barbe-Marbois seems to have been more complaisant, for he evasively hinted at the West Florida claim and suggested the possibility of extension to the Pacific, even without the color of a claim. At any rate, Livingston started the fantastic interpretation of the treaty under which we laid claim to West Florida, while Monroe emphasized the possibility of exchanging Texas (although he did not know the country in dispute under that name) for the rest of the Floridas. Neither Madison nor Jefferson was willing to agree to so extensive a concession to Spain, even though Claiborne and other frontier authorities favored the relinquishment of all territory west of the Sabine.¹¹ The first duty of our government, however, was to make sure of our new acquisition and to defend ourselves from the charge of complicity in Napoleon's faithlessness, and to this end all the efforts of our officials at Washington, New Orleans, London, Paris, and Madrid, were for some months directed.

While Jefferson and his subordinates were thus giving the widest latitude to claims to Louisiana, it is hardly likely that he received with favor the meagre information that his frontier correspondents were able to furnish. This was opposed to his interpretation of these claims, and to that of Livingston and Monroe, which the administration had by this time completely adopted. It is not surprising, therefore, that in the printed report upon Louisiana, dated November 14, 1803, he said almost nothing about boundaries or allied topics.¹² Whatever may have been his intention, he probably realized the force of Clark's suggestion that this boundary question was diplomatic rather than geographical in character, and a fair matter for compromise, as he himself afterwards suggested to Dunbar.¹³ In this negotiation the United States would be at a

¹¹Cf. Hamilton, *Writings of Monroe*, IV, 24-26; *Am. State Paps. For. Rel.*, II, 627; and *Claiborne Correspondence*, MSS., Bureau of Rolls and Library. (See Parker, Nos. 6919, 6998, and 7006.)

¹²*Annals 8th Cong., 2d Sess.*, 1498 ff. He may have intended at first to assert the Bravo claim, for a side note to this effect is crossed out in the manuscript summary of the letters of Clark, Dunbar *et al.* in the *Claiborne Correspondence*, Vol. I, MSS., Bureau of Rolls and Library. Casa Yrujo's vigorous protests against the validity of the Purchase, or the fear of complications with the French minister may have deterred him.

¹³Washington, H. A., *Works of Jefferson*, IV, 530.

disadvantage in comparison with the documentary store houses possessed by Spain, and this fact determined Jefferson to explore thoroughly his new acquisition. At the same time he attempted other sources of information, including the eminent scientist Humboldt, then visiting the United States. In his letter to the latter Jefferson states that Spain claims to the Mexicana with a line running from its source to the Red, while the United States claims to the Bravo, and he asks the scientist to state the population between these rivers. The English minister, Merry, writes that the Spaniards regard Louisiana as including only a "confined tract" west of the Mississippi and extending only as far north as the Missouri, while the Americans claimed westward to Santa Fé and northward to the source of the Mississippi. The adjustment, as in the case of the Florida disputes, would cause some difficulty.¹⁴

There were then few public men in the United States who were prepared to discuss Louisiana boundaries with the president. Among those outside of Congress the most important was Rufus King, who had just returned from the mission to England, and he seemed to favor the "Bravo" as the western limit. In 1801, he had so expressed himself to Lord Hawkesbury, and in August following the purchase, he gave Gallatin to understand that his position was still unchanged. If we may judge from the attitude of his close friend, Timothy Pickering, he later held the opposite view, but possibly the rejection of the article, in his Convention of May 12, 1803, which related to the Northwestern limit of the United States, may account for the attitude of both men.¹⁵

The House debate over the Louisiana Treaty gave the opportunity for a congressional interpretation of the metes and bounds of our new acquisition. Because of the great uncertainty upon these points some hesitated to approve appropriations to carry out the convention. Mitchell of Georgia, however, voiced the general sentiment that they should accept the province with such boundaries as it was generally understood to possess, and then, after necessary exploration, appoint diplomatic commissioners to settle these lim-

¹⁴Memorial Edition of Jefferson's *Works*, XI, 27; Merry to Hawkesbury, January 16, 1804. *Foreign Office, America*, II, 5-41, Public Record Office.

¹⁵Cf. King, *Correspondence and Papers of Rufus King*, IV, 329-332, 363, 554, 555. Pickering was especially bitter in criticizing Jefferson for emphasizing Crozat's Grant—a mere commercial concession. See *Jefferson Papers*, Ser. 2, Vol. 66, No. 36.

its. John Randolph claimed to have "some light"—probably a reflection from Jefferson's Monticello library—upon the western limit of Louisiana. La Salle's colony, he believed, afforded the United States a claim to the "grand river of the North," which limit embraced some very valuable Spanish territory, including the "rich mines of St. Barbe" and Santa Fé. On the other hand, he believed that the settlement at Adaes gave Spain a right to the Sabine and the highlands dividing the waters of the "North River" from those of the Mississippi, but not the "shadow of a claim" beyond. The extensive territory in dispute he expected to be profitably employed in exchange for the Floridas and in securing all the country watered by the Mississippi.¹⁶

None of the senators ventured to make a definite statement regarding the limits of Louisiana. Breckenridge forgot the Kentucky Resolutions sufficiently to favor the expansion of our republic beyond the Mississippi, for he asserted that the Goddess of Liberty was not to be restrained by water courses. Pickering believed that the French government had purposely obscured the question of limits as well as other features of the treaty. Dayton, of New Jersey, who, thanks to Wilkinson, had spent a very pleasant summer among the New Orleans creoles, emphasized the fact that the French and Spanish officials each had a different interpretation of the western boundary of Louisiana. On the whole these utterances show that the members of neither house possessed any definite knowledge regarding the extent of Louisiana. In lieu of anything better the majority were willing to accept the president's view and trust the future to decide the question in a way most favorable to the United States.¹⁷

A few months later Congress attempted to hasten this decision. The Spanish government had formally withdrawn its protest against the alienation of Louisiana, and the formal transfer of the province had occurred at New Orleans. Feeling secure in their new acquisition, Congress, by the so-called "Mobile Act" of February, 1804, attempted the first distinct assertion of the West Florida claim.¹⁸ Before the fiasco of this act became clearly manifest, the same body approached, but in a different manner, the western

¹⁶Cf. *Annals 8th Cong., 1st Sess.*, 401, 486.

¹⁷*Annals 8th Cong., 1st Sess.*, 47, 48, 60.

¹⁸Cf. H. Adams, *History of the United States*, II, 257, 258.

boundary of Louisiana. The Act of March 26, 1804, divided the acquisition into two portions, the southern of which, called Orleans Territory, was to be bounded on the north by the thirty-third parallel, and to "extend west to the western boundary of said cession."¹⁹ Thus Congress made no attempt to define the western extent of Louisiana.

By this time the President and Cabinet seem to have reached the sentiment that Jefferson expressed in a letter to William Dunbar: "However much we may compromise on our western limits, we never shall on our eastern."²⁰ On the 15th of the following month Madison, in his instructions to Monroe concerning the anticipated Spanish negotiation, expressed, among other subjects, the "united opinion" of the Cabinet regarding the western limit of Louisiana. Between the possessions of the United States and Spain a neutral zone was to be established, doubtless in deference to the antipathy that Spain had always manifested against near neighbors of vigorous type. This zone was to be bounded on the east by the Sabine from its mouth to its source, a limit that may have been due to the suggestions of Claiborne, Clark, and Dunbar. From the source of the Sabine the line should be drawn directly to the junction of the Osage with the Missouri, and there should continue parallel with the Mississippi to its source. Such a line would very closely approximate the western extent of French settlement in this region, and should be compared with a later suggestion by Talleyrand.²¹ The western limit of this zone was the Colorado (or some other river emptying into St. Bernard's Bay), with a line from its source to the most southwesterly source of the Red River, making such deflections as were necessary to include all of its branches. Thence the limit should follow along the highlands, forming the watershed between the Mississippi and Missouri on one side and the Rio Grande on the other, to the latitude of the most northern source of the last named river, and thence by a meridian to the northern boundary of Louisiana.²²

It will be noted that this neutral zone was to include a large part of the "undoubted limits" of Louisiana. This need cause no surprise in view of the attitude of many public men at this time in

¹⁹*Annals 8th Cong., 1st Sess.*, 1293.

²⁰Washington, H. A., *Works of Jefferson*, IV, 539.

²¹See H. Adams, *Hist. of the U. S.*, II, 299, 300.

²²*Am. State Papers, For. Rel.*, II, 628 *et seq.*

favor of closing the territory west of the Mississippi to settlement. Then, too, the United States was not to relinquish its rights in this region. That power was to remove all those who had settled within it since 1800. Each nation was to be permitted to trade with the Indians settled therein and to remove Indians from its own territory within the zone, the police powers of which were to be vested in the United States. Madison stated that he and his colleagues believed that the American claim to the "Bravo" was valid, so their proposal represented a very liberal concession which called for an equally liberal one on the part of Spain, in regard to the territory east of the Perdido. The United States, the Secretary warned Monroe, was to yield no more western territory than was absolutely necessary and by no means to deprive itself of the waters running into the Missouri or the Mississippi, or any of the waters emptying into the Gulf between the Mississippi and the Colorado.

In these instructions Madison stated the claims and concessions of the United States as definitely as current knowledge permitted. Further information regarding Louisiana, perhaps derived from Humboldt or Wilkinson, or from Lewis's early letters, or more probably the prospect that Spain would be forced into a war with England, led the administration to modify them. Jefferson preferred that the neutral zone should include the territory between the Rio Grande and the Colorado, or if necessary between the former and the Sabine, but if possible he wished our commissioners to avoid the perpetual relinquishment of any territory east of the "Bravo"—even in exchange for the Floridas east of the Perdido. He evidently was determined to make the most of Spain's necessity. Gallatin, however, dissented from his views, so Jefferson wrote Madison, July 6, 1804, that the previous views of the cabinet remained unchanged.²³

Madison's instructions of July 8, 1804, therefore, did not differ materially from the previous ones, except that the neutral zone was to be extended westward to include the territory between the Colorado and the Rio Grande, while all lines drawn from its eastern limit, whether the Sabine or the Colorado, should have a northwest trend rather than one due north. This latter provision was due to the prospective rapid expansion of American settlement west of

²³*Jefferson Papers*, 1st Ser., Vol. X, No. 113.

the Mississippi.²⁴ Madison sent these instructions to Monroe and Charles Pinckney, but did not absolutely preclude them from ceding to the Sabine as the ultimate limit of the neutral strip. A few months later he even sanctioned the abandonment of any pretensions of the United States to a claim beyond the Colorado, the Red, and the watershed of the Mississippi basin, in order to facilitate our claims to the Perdido and the purchase of the territory beyond.²⁵ Thus Texas was to be sacrificed to West Florida, and this sacrifice might ultimately include all territory west of the Sabine.

The American interest in the boundaries of Louisiana seemed largely of an academic kind—a scientific desire to establish logical boundaries rather than an overwhelming passion to raise a barrier against an unwelcome neighbor. Spain's interest in the question surpassed that of the United States; her records relating to that province and its neighbors were more voluminous. But her officials, especially her minister at Philadelphia, the Marques de Casa Yrujo, frankly confessed their ignorance of the disputed border region and emphasized the necessity of obtaining more definite information concerning it. Casa Yrujo even applied to General James Wilkinson to assist him in this matter.²⁶ In this connection his despatch of November 5, 1803, enclosing the translation of a pamphlet published under the nom de plume "Silvestris" (which he perhaps ill-advisedly attributes to Madison) is of some interest in the boundary dispute.²⁷ The pamphlet definitely claims the Rio Grande as the western limit of Louisiana and also the chain of mountains in which that river and the Missouri rise. Casa Yrujo does not specifically dispute the claim. His silence is curious but not conclusive, for it may indicate his uncertainty rather than his willingness to permit the statement to remain unchallenged. The Spanish minister also regarded the vast extent of Louisiana as a weakness to the United States, provided Spain retained possession of both the Floridas.

²⁴*Am. State Papers, For. Rel.*, II, 630. Ford, *Writings of Jefferson*, VIII, 309.

²⁵*Am. State Papers, For. Rel.*, II, 632.

²⁶Casa Yrujo to Cevallos, February 7, 1805. *Adams Transcripts*, Bureau of Rolls and Library, State Department. Robertson, No. 5021.

²⁷This is Casa Yrujo's Dispatch No. 380 and is No. 4927 in Robertson's list. The pamphlet itself is No. 4887. The fact that its author makes no claim to West Florida favors the conclusion that he was not Madison.

Fortunately for Spain her frontier officers possessed greater knowledge of her rights in the disputed territory and a greater determination to secure them, although they did not always work harmoniously to that end. When, in October, 1802, Governor Manuel de Salcedo received from his home government the order to transfer the province of Louisiana to the French representative, he immediately discovered many dubious points in his instructions, upon which he sought more explicit information. Among these was the indefiniteness of the article in the Treaty of San Ildefonso regarding limits which led him to emphasize the necessity for fixing the boundary between Louisiana and the Interior Provinces, so as to avoid any further trouble. There should be no difficulty in doing this, if they took advantage of the rivers which abounded in that region. In his view it was especially important to fix the limits in Upper Louisiana, where the English were attempting to approach the Interior Provinces by way of the Missouri. The home authorities agreed with him in the necessity for promptness in this measure and appointed him and the Marqués de Casa Calvo, who possessed considerable knowledge of the country based on personal observation, as commissioners to carry on a joint survey with the French. José Martinez was associated with them as chief engineer. Shortly afterwards the joint commissioners requested Nimecio Salcedo to give them all the information he possessed in regard to the limits of Texas with the neighboring provinces.²⁸

A few days before the transfer of Louisiana to the United States, Governor Manuel Salcedo submitted some "observations" in which he emphasized the rights of Spain, based upon the establishment at Adaes, and claimed that the French had remained at Natchitoches only because of Spanish sufferance. He stated that the French fort, situated upon the right bank of the Red ("Colorado") was taken as the starting point in running the line between the two claimants and that this line was to be drawn due south to the sea and north to the Red, which was to continue as the limit to its source. Later the French were permitted to remove their fort still further to the westward, and the "Bayou del laurel" from its confluence with the Red to its source was made the boundary; thence

²⁸Robertson, Nos. 4874 and 4896. *Mississippi Archives*. Casa Calvo and Manuel de Salcedo to Nimecio de Salcedo, July 8, 1803. *Archivo General de Indias, Papeles procedentes de la Isla de Cuba*, Legajo 185.

the line returned to the Red. Still later, when the Spaniards abandoned Adaes and ultimately established themselves at Nacogdoches, the French subjects of Spain were permitted to trade freely to the Sabine, and even in the region beyond Nacogdoches, provided the commandant of the latter post gave them the necessary permission.²⁹

Some three weeks after the transfer of Louisiana to the Americans, Casa Calvo wrote to his superior that the Americans were preparing to assert an "absurd claim" to the mouth of the "Bravo" and that the French commissioner supported them in this contention. From his own personal knowledge of the region and from information derived from others, Casa Calvo stated that he was prepared to overthrow this claim. He also cited the report from St. Louis concerning Captain "Merrywhether" Lewis's expedition as evidence of the danger threatening Spain's interests in Mexico if the United States continued to hold any territory whatever west of the Mississippi.³⁰ A few days later his colleague joined him in a communication to Laussat, the French commissioner, in which they asserted that the western boundary of Louisiana began at the mouth of the Sabine and extended to within a few miles of Natchitoches, in such a way as to include Adaes. The two Spaniards then asked him to give them his opinion before he left the province.³¹

In his reply of January 20, 1804, Laussat states that he was "vaguely charged to take possession of the country according to the terms of the treaty and without other demarcation of limits." The interests of his government had not required him to attempt any such demarcation and he was not authorized to do so, but to them as representatives of a friendly and intimately allied power, he quoted his instructions concerning the limits of the retroceded province: "On the south, the Gulf of Mexico; on the west, the Rio Bravo from its mouth up to thirty degrees of North Latitude, from which point the line of demarcation is undetermined towards the Northwest and likewise towards the Northern line, which is lost in the vast solitudes in which there are no European establishments

²⁹Robertson, *Louisiana under Spain, France and the United States, 1785-1807*, II, 150 *et seq.* It is needless to point out the fact that Salcedo's information is not very accurate.

³⁰*Ibid.*, 162-167.

³¹*Ibid.*, 168-171.

and in which it appears that they have never yet felt the necessity for limits."³²

In private conversation Laussat likewise communicated his instructions to the American commissioners Wilkinson and Claiborne. He may have experienced a certain malicious pleasure in doing this and thus causing a bitter controversy between the Americans and the Spaniards, for he felt that the latter had treated him with undeserved neglect and even with hostility. The Spaniards believed that the purpose of the French government concerning the western boundary, in contrast with the eastern, arose from a desire to embroil the two nations in a conflict from which they themselves would later obtain signal advantages.³³

Nimecio de Salcedo, the general commandant of the Interior Provinces, did not regard the appointment of this boundary commission with favor and showed himself ready to handicap its work, especially after Casa Calvo, by the retirement of his brother, became sole commissioner. He had himself expressed an opinion of the western limit of Louisiana in a communication to the home government, bearing the date of October 4, 1803. In this he stated that the line should begin on the Gulf between the "Caricut and Mermontou" and extend northwards to the Red River in the vicinity of Natchitoches. The northern limit of Louisiana was unknown, but he claimed that the jurisdiction of Texas and New Mexico extended to the Missouri River.

Upon royal order a special *junta* assembled at Madrid to consider the matter. In spite of the fact that its members lacked all definite geographical knowledge of the subject, they resolved to assert a definite claim to the waters of the Calcasieu ("Caricut") and the post of Adaes, as points always within their possession. Moreover the Spanish commissioners should claim the western banks of the Red and of the Mississippi below its mouth, with the exception of the post of Natchitoches, unless the opposing commissioners could show that other French settlements tributary to

³²*Ibid.*, 172. The translation is my own from the copy in the Mississippi Archives. This statement follows closely that quoted by Henry Adams, *Hist. of U. S.*, II, 6, and by Robertson, *loc. cit.*, 141, n. 62. The Bravo to 29° is mentioned as a possible limit between Louisiana and New Mexico in the project for a treaty with Spain, dated November 18, 1802. Cf. *Affaires Etrangères, Supplement*, Vol. VII, p. 245. *Ministère des Affaires Etrangères, Paris*.

³³See page 10.

New Orleans had once existed within that area. Even if this were true the *junta* did not grant that such settlements could now be claimed as part of Louisiana any more than East Florida formed part of Cuba because subject to that island. At all events, the Americans must not be permitted to navigate the Red and other tributaries of the Mississippi above the point where the final boundary should touch those rivers.³⁴ In transmitting their report Cevallos expressed a preference for a simple boundary rather than an intervening neutral strip.³⁵

Despite the statement that the French Prefect gave the Americans the Spanish representatives protested against the interpretation that the Rio Grande was the western boundary of Louisiana. In a later communication to Cevallos, Casa Calvo stated that until he received orders to the contrary he should begin the demarcation at no other place than the mouth of the Sabine, and that he should follow this to the "Bayou des Lauriers," two leagues from Natchitoches, which report indicated as the spot where the boundary between Texas and Louisiana was marked. Meanwhile he should attempt to gain all additional information regarding the Sabine and the Bravo and the intervening coast from the observations of Captain Don Ciriaco Ceballos, who was in charge of the revenue vessels on the coast, and he hoped his course would merit official approbation.³⁶ In this he was not disappointed.

The French traveler, C. C. Robin, who chanced to be in Louisiana at the time of the transfer, rendered much more assistance to Casa Calvo than did Laussat. He seems to have formed a very unfavorable opinion of the American officials and settlers, and this led him to suggest to Casa Calvo what methods Spain should employ to retain the territory lying between Louisiana and Mexico. Casa Calvo employed Robin to visit M. de Blanc, a descendant of the famous St. Denis, then living in Natchitoches. From him the French traveler obtained some valuable information concerning the early French claims west of the Mississippi from which he prepared a memoir for Casa Calvo. He represented Louisiana as compris-

³⁴MSS. *Archivo General, Mexico, Provincias Internas*, Vol. 200. *Dictamen of Junta*, Madrid, March 17, 1804.

³⁵Francisco Gil to Cevallos, April 6, 1804. *Ibid.*

³⁶Robertson, Nos. 4956, 4965, 4968. *Miss Archives*.

ing very little territory west of the Mississippi, and in other ways favored the Spanish position in regard to the western limits.⁸⁷

Robin stated that the Arroyo Hondo (he calls it "le Grand Ruisseau") is the stream that the Spaniards have always scrupulously regarded as the western limit of Louisiana. Between this stream and the Red lay the only territory that France ever occupied on the latter river. Elsewhere the banks of the Red, and of the Mississippi below its mouth, belong to Spain. He also declared that France once possessed a right to that portion of the Arkansas controlled by Tonty's former post, and to the mouth of the Missouri; but the United States could claim nothing beyond these restricted areas. In this way he more than emphasized the Spanish claim east of the Sabine. He followed contemporary Spanish frontier officials in favoring the Mississippi as the ultimate boundary. Casa Calvo and his engineer, Martinez, evidently used Robin's suggestions in their later reports to Cevallos, and in addition incorporated certain observations drawn from the previous experience of Athanacio de Mezieres. They asserted the right of Spain to the watershed between the Calcasieu and Mermentou and to the "Bayou des Lauriers." If the Americans were ready to begin the survey in a short time, they should insist upon going no further west than the Sabine. The American claim to the Bravo, they stated, included not only a large part of the Interior Provinces, but also a possible extension to the Pacific. Against such pretensions they must make a resolute stand.⁸⁸

II. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF BORDER RELATIONS WITH THE SPANIARDS

The leisurely discussion at diplomatic centers of the boundaries of Louisiana with a view to their final determination promised to continue for an indefinite period. Meanwhile the actual solution was being worked out on the very frontiers in dispute. The area of occupation was a more important factor than diplomatic skill, even when aided by unlimited archival stores. For more than

⁸⁷Cox, *Early Exploration of Louisiana*, 62, 63. Robin, C. C., *Voyages dans L'Interieur de Louisiana*, etc., III, 141 et seq.

⁸⁸Robertson, Nos. 4985 and 4993. These references are to transcripts in the collections of the Missouri Historical Society, for the use of which I am indebted to the courtesy of Judge Walter B. Douglas.

two decades before 1803 scattered settlements and army posts on the eastern bank of the Mississippi had afforded to a few adventurous American settlers and traders a base from which to press forward into Louisiana and Texas. Now others were ready to carry these settlements and posts into Louisiana itself and from this new base to extend their operations still further within the Interior Provinces and even to threaten the Mexican Viceroyalty. While the Americans were initiating this important work of expansion, the Spaniards were exerting every effort to restrict this movement within the smallest possible limits. Thus they desired to render Louisiana, in the language of Jefferson, "only a string of land west of the Mississippi"—provided it were necessary to allow them any holding whatever in that region—while the Americans strove to push its boundaries to the Bravo and the Rockies. But the Spaniards were not more united in their policy of restriction than were the Americans in pushing their claims to the uttermost.

The Marqués de Casa Yrujo, the Spanish minister to the United States, did not regard the cession of Louisiana to the United States as an unmixed evil. The consequent spread of population from the east of the Mississippi to the west of that river would weaken the American Union. Spain had only to fear greater facilities for contraband trading, but such practices by the new possessors of Louisiana might be checked or absolutely prohibited if his nation had the power to make reprisals from the Floridas. Thus East and West Florida, and particularly the latter, might serve as outposts for New Spain.¹ On the other hand, Governor Manuel Salcedo, at New Orleans, believed that great disadvantages to Spain would follow, if the Americans continued to hold the right (he calls it "left") bank of the Mississippi; and the only way to prevent this would be for Spain to relinquish both the Floridas in return for the cession of the other region.² The Marqués de Casa Calvo, with whom he was temporarily associated, agreed with him in his belief that "the dyke . . . to restrain the sweep" of American immigration must be erected on the banks of the Mississippi.

¹Casa Yrujo to Cevallos, August 3, 1803. Robertson, *Louisiana*, II, 69-77.

²Salcedo to Caballero, December 13, 1803. *Ibid.*, 148.

He also cited the presence of Merriwether Lewis on the Missouri as a specific instance of an American design to possess the entire course of that river and also portions of Sonora and Sinaloa. This could not be prevented as long as the Americans controlled the lower courses of the Mississippi's western tributaries. In closing his dispatch he apologetically reminded Cevallos that he who preserved Mexico for Spain would gain greater renown than Cortes who conquered it.³ The Governor of West Florida, Vizente Folch, despite the advice of Wilkinson, wished Spain to retain both the Floridas and the right bank of the Mississippi, for he considered the former the "antemural" of Cuba, and the latter of New Spain. If the Americans were permitted to pass such an important natural barrier as the Mississippi, which no one would have imagined possible five years before, they would soon realize their ambition to possess a port on the Pacific. What, then, would become of Spain's American possessions?⁴ The next ten years were to answer his question.

While Spanish officials were predicting the fearful consequences to follow the French or American possession of Louisiana, the Americans themselves were giving serious attention to its boundary problems. On May 1, 1803, Madison wrote Monroe that Citizen Laussat had arrived at New Orleans and that Casa Calvo was shortly expected. The main purpose of this dispatch was to assure Monroe that in the formal transfer, in which these two men were concerned, our rights under the Treaty of 1795 were to be preserved.⁵ Possibly Madison wished to conceal his own anxiety upon this point. In July, however, this anxiety assumed a new phase and one of unexpected personal interest. The Americans were to possess Louisiana, provided Casa Yrujo's protests against the transfer to them and his refusal to sign certain documents connected with that act, did not prevent its consummation. However, in due time, Governor Claiborne reported the passage through Natchez, on November 26, of the French officer bearing the necessary credentials for Laussat.⁶ On the 30th that official formally

³Casa Calvo to Cevallos, January 13, 1804, *Ibid.*, 166; Casa Calvo to Prince of Peace, September 30, 1804. Robertson, No. 5001.

⁴Folch to Someruelos, April 10, 1804 (Cf. n. 16, page 38, below.)

⁵*Letters and Other Writings of Madison*, II, 182.

⁶*Louisiana Purchase, 1803-1804*, MSS., Bureau of Rolls and Library, Parker, No. 6893.

received the province from Salcedo and Casa Calvo, preparatory to handing it over to the Americans.

The tidings of this transfer to France, though welcome, caused Madison's anxiety to assume a new turn. In that act nothing was said of the boundaries in general, and, of course, nothing about West Florida, the chief concern of the administration. On December 20 occurred the formal transfer of the province to the American commissioners, Claiborne and Wilkinson. Some days before the tidings of this event reached Washington the administration learned through Charles Pinckney, our minister at Madrid, that the Spanish government had withdrawn all opposition to this transfer. So no untoward event occurred to mar the ceremony. Claiborne, uncomfortable in his new surroundings, did, indeed, report a warning given by Laussat, that the Spaniards were reinforcing the Mexican border—a policy which his colleague Wilkinson advised them to follow.⁷ Another chance remark, attributed to Laussat, that “the harvest of Louisiana were (sic) not yet secured to the United States,” caused Claiborne to fear that the province might still revert to France, if hostilities in Europe should cease, and to express the wish that Laussat would not delay his departure.⁸ In view of the service that Laussat was then rendering in regard to the western boundary, such insistence savors of ingratitude. Claiborne soon found that there were others tarrying at New Orleans, whose departure he would regret even less than that of Laussat.

After the formal ceremony at New Orleans, the French commissioner, in conjunction with the Spanish officials, proceeded to issue the necessary orders for the delivery of the outlying posts to the Americans. Those for the posts at Attakapas, Opelousas, and Concord were promptly forthcoming; those for Natchitoches, Washita, and the posts of upper Louisiana, only after a month's delay. This was due to the tardiness of the Spanish officials, and their action was not surprising in view of their desire to retain the western bank of the Mississippi. Claiborne later explained that his own subsequent delay in taking possession of the posts on the Washita and at Natchitoches arose from the continued presence

⁷Claiborne to Madison, February 26, 1804, *Claiborne Correspondence*, MSS., Vol. II, Parker, 6950. Cf. also Robertson, No. 4885.

⁸Claiborne to Madison, May 14, 1804. Parker, No. 6933.

of so many Spanish troops at New Orleans. While they remained he was unwilling to weaken the meagre American force there by sending detachments to the outlying posts in lower Louisiana.⁹

On April 15, Lieutenant William Bowmar reported that he had taken possession of the post on the "Ouachita" (Fort Miró on the "Washita," to adopt the later spelling). This post was the center of a string of settlements twenty-eight miles long on that river. The neighboring population composed of some 450 settlers,—Irish, French-Canadians, Santo Domingans, and Americans—seemed to be pleased with the transfer, but Robin, who was then present, criticized the policy of the American government in appointing so young a man for this responsible post. But when Hunter and Dunbar visited the region, nine months later, they spoke very favorably of the rule maintained by this young officer.¹⁰

The frontier post of Natchitoches was the gateway to Texas and the Interior Provinces beyond, and for this reason possessed an importance second only to New Orleans and St. Louis. A report of October 31, 1803, states that thirty-two Spanish troops formed its guard.¹¹ This insignificant force readily yielded the post to an American contingent (barely twice their own) under the command of Captain Edwin Turner. At 11 o'clock, April 20, 1804, the French tri-color replaced the Spanish flag, and an hour later the Stars and Stripes followed.¹² The former garrison then retired to Nacogdoches, the only remaining monument in Eastern Texas of the Spaniard's missionary and contraband effort. Later they were joined by the dragoons that had formerly been stationed at New Orleans. These troops, combined with the garrison already existing at that point, formed for the Spaniards a modest force wholly inadequate to the demands aroused by their jealous fears of the Americans. On the other hand the equally unfounded apprehensions of the latter unduly magnified the modest resources of their opponents.

⁹Claiborne to Madison, May 14, 1804, *Ibid.*, No. 6988.

¹⁰Cox, *Early Exploration of Louisiana*, 48; Robin, *Voyages dans l'Intérieur de la Louisiana*, II, 384; Bowmar to Claiborne, April 15, 1804, Parker, No. 6989. In Hamersley, *Complete Army Register*, p. 51, a "James Bomer" is given as first lieutenant in the Second Regiment.

¹¹Report of José Joaquín Ugarte, MSS., *Bexar Archives*.

¹²Turner to Claiborne, May 1, 1804. *Claiborne Correspondence*, II.

Most of those who witnessed the simple ceremony marking the double transfer seemed satisfied with the change. But among the few malcontents Turner noted the Spanish commandant of Nacogdoches, who was afterwards reproved by Nimecio de Salcedo for being present on this occasion.¹³ In alluding to the intercourse between Louisiana and Texas that official was reported as saying: "It is now finished and the door is shut forever."¹⁴ The future speedily demonstrated that Ugarte was no prophet, while the existence of a trade contrary to Spanish regulations and already largely in the hands of the Americans, was a sufficient comment upon his own rule and that of his fellow officers.

According to later American interpretation the peaceable delivery of the post at Natchitoches carried with it the control of the territory as far west as the Sabine, but the Spaniards refused to recognize this. As we have already seen, they hoped to keep the Americans entirely east of the Mississippi by the bribe of the Floridas, but failing in that they were determined to insist upon the whole of Texas, which, as they claimed, extended to the Arroyo Hondo, a few leagues west of Natchitoches. Their policy was to hold this as a *sine qua non* and by negotiation to secure as much additional territory as possible between that point and the Mississippi River.

A minor event that illustrates this policy is shown in their retention of the small frontier settlement of Bayou Pierre, on the Red River, about fifty leagues northwest of Natchitoches. It was formerly a French outpost, but by agreement had been placed under the jurisdiction of the commandant at Nacogdoches. Design on the part of the Spaniards and ignorance on the part of the Americans were alike responsible for the failure to include this in the formal transfer at Natchitoches. It gave color to the Spanish claim of jurisdiction east of the Sabine, yet Jefferson was willing to acquiesce in their temporary control as an act of international courtesy and out of respect for the principle of maintaining the *status quo* until all the frontier questions could be settled by treaty. The incident was regarded of sufficient importance, however, to be mentioned in subsequent diplomatic correspondence and in the

¹³Salcedo to Governor of Texas, January 23, 1805, MSS., *Provincias Internas*, Vol. 200, *Archivo General*, Mexico.

¹⁴Cf. Note 12.

President's message. While the Spaniards actually had no guard there in 1803 they certainly maintained a small one two years later, and its commander caused the Indian agent, John Sibley, considerable uneasiness.¹⁵

As we have already seen, there was a general fear among Spanish officials, both in the Old World and the New, that the occupation of Louisiana by the Americans would facilitate their entrance into the Internal Provinces. Casa Calvo, Folch, Salcedo, and their fellow officials felt apprehensive that the vast unguarded area extending without natural barriers from Hudson's Bay to the Gulf of Mexico would, through its numerous water-courses, afford a series of open highways to Mexico. Even with such a well defined limit as the Mississippi, it had been impossible to keep the restless British and American adventurers upon their own territory. When, therefore, this limit was likely to be placed anywhere between that river and the Rio Grande, and when it was likely to be a mere conventional line unmarked by strong natural features, this task seemed well nigh hopeless. Yet the authorities of the Internal Provinces, the region most exposed to these unwelcome inroads, assumed with determination the task of protecting their sovereign's dominions from the foreigner. If they seem to exhibit the customary Spanish thoroughness in formulating decree and laxity in enforcing it, these conditions were due to the miserable resources at their disposal.

Shortly after the transfer was consummated the Spanish officials gained an important recruit—in advice, if not in deeds, General Wilkinson, who had taken part in that act as the colleague of Governor Claiborne, called upon Vizente Folch when the latter chanced to be in New Orleans. In the course of a long conversation he made many "reflections" upon the consequences which might be expected to follow the cession of Louisiana, and promised to commit them to writing for perusal by Captain-General Someruelos at Havana.¹⁶ At the end of the interview Wilkinson brought up what

¹⁵Madison to Armstrong, November 10, 1806, MSS., *Instructions*, Vol. 6, Bureau of Indexes and Archives, State Department; *Annals 9th Cong., 2d Sess.*, 1077 *et seq.* Jefferson's *Works* (Memorial Edition), VIII, 193.

¹⁶The Mississippi State Department of Archives and History contains a copy of the "Reflections," which Robertson lists as No. 4885. He likewise published this in *Louisiana under Spain, France and the United States, 1785-1807*, II, 325-347. This copy, as I am informed by Mr. Roscoe R. Hill, is made from a triplicate, one accompanying Folch's *Reservada* No. 3.

Folch terms an "embarrassing point." It speedily developed that the embarrassment was of the financial kind that Wilkinson generally experienced. Years before the Spanish government had promised him an annual pension of two thousand dollars. A chain of circumstances that concern other phases of Southwestern history had prevented the payment of this pension for the past ten years. Wilkinson was now on the point of departing for the seat of government and needed the money. Hence his visit with its accompanying "reflections." Hence his promise to sound "the heart of the President" and make due report thereon to the Spanish authorities.

Governor Folch was in a quandary. His own salary was never paid fully and promptly, so he did not have twenty thousand dollars for Wilkinson, although he seems persuaded that the latter's services were worth that sum. The relations between himself and the intendant, Morales, who handled the finances, were not cordial, so the latter might reveal the secret out of jealousy toward himself as well as unfriendliness toward Wilkinson. The only recourse would be an application to Casa Calvo, who, as boundary commissioner, had lately received a remittance of 100,000 pesos from Mexico. Possibly the payment of so large a sum as this to Casa Calvo, despite the uncertainty that surrounded his work, may indicate the importance that the Spanish government placed upon the settlement of its boundaries. Or possibly it may represent a sum to be expended in just such emergencies as now presented itself. At any rate, Casa Calvo had money while the regular frontier officials had little or none.

Wilkinson demurred at presenting his case to Casa Calvo. The latter's secretary, Armesto, must perforce act as interpreter, for Casa Calvo did not "possess the English idiom." Armesto was a friend of Morales, an intimate of Daniel Clark's, who in turn corresponded with Jefferson. Thus Wilkinson feared that the

to Someruelos, dated April 10, 1804. At present this is found in Legajo No. 2355 of the *Cuban Papers*. As it is signed by Folch to attest its genuineness, and is unaccompanied by any other explanatory documents, Dr. Robertson naturally assigns its authorship to the Spanish governor and thus misses its real significance. During the last summer I discovered in Legajo No. 1574 of the *Cuban Papers*, Folch's *Reservada No. 3*, an *Informe*, in which he expresses dissent from many of Wilkinson's views, and other documents that clearly establish the General's authorship and afford additional evidence of his venality. Mr. C. E. Chapman has recently copied these for me and I hope soon to publish them.

President would be warned from the very source that was to profit by his betrayal. Yet the financial necessity was apparently overpowering, for Wilkinson finally agreed that Casa Calvo should enter into the secret and that he should carry on the affair directly with himself and not through Folch as intermediary. This point Folch submitted to the captain-general for determination. Wilkinson asked that in addition to those already mentioned, Cevallos in Spain, and Gilbert Leonard, the royal *contador* of West Florida, be the only ones admitted into the plot. This seems to have been the case, for he whom Folch later terms "the Prophet Daniel," never learned what would have been a most welcome addition to his "Proofs of the Corruption of General James Wilkinson."

The sum of money that Casa Calvo paid Wilkinson at this time was twelve thousand rather than the twenty thousand demanded. This met with royal approval. Wilkinson had asked that his pension be raised to four thousand pesos, his salary as commander of the American army. Someruelos held this up pending royal approval, which was not forthcoming. As an earnest of the seriousness of his intentions Wilkinson presented his "Reflections" shortly after his interview with Folch, and for the next few years carried on in cipher with him and with Casa Calvo a fragmentary correspondence that seems more despicable in purpose than dangerous in execution.

The text of the "Reflections" emphasizes the use of the Floridas as a bribe with which to obtain the right bank of the Mississippi or at least so much of it as would suit Spain's policy of excluding the Americans from Mexico. Wilkinson begins by mentioning the prodigious growth of the States west of the mountains during the preceding thirty years. In this development he had occupied a prominent, if not wholly honorable, part. He mentioned that the retrocession of Louisiana to France ("that Gothic power") aroused the "sensibilities of every Spanish patriot" (doubtless including himself); while its transfer to the United States "for a sordid consideration" (How distasteful to him!) "opens great dangers to the American dominions of Spain." He believed that France, "always intriguing, unquiet and impatient," was trying to stir up trouble between Spain and the United States over the western boundary in order to derive some profit from the controversy. He thought that Spain possessed a great advantage in the Floridas, from which

it might dominate the Indians in the vicinity and prevent an invasion of the Interior Provinces. If Monroe's projected mission to Spain for the purchase of the Floridas should be successful, he trembled for the mournful consequences to Spain. The United States would immediately attempt to gain its western claims by force—a course of action they would not dare undertake if the Floridas were not in their possession. The only remedy was to make an even trade of the Floridas for the region west of the Mississippi. Any yielding to American pretensions would mean the giving up the key of the kingdoms of Mexico and Peru to what he terms an "army of adventurers similar to the ancient Goths and Vandals." In this fashion does he speak of those rugged western pioneers whom he had been able to deceive rather than corrupt.

Wilkinson also gave suggestions in regard to the fortification of West Florida and the Texas frontier. Nacogdoches should be strongly garrisoned, with a port and supplemental post of observation on the Sabine or at Matagorda Bay. The Spanish government should firmly establish its hold on the Southern Indians and at the same time should secretly promote the plans of the Americans to remove the most powerful tribes across the Mississippi. In case this policy were carried out the Indians would take with them a mortal hatred of the Americans which the Spaniards might turn to their own advantage, even employing them to destroy all the American settlements west of the Mississippi. He mentioned that Jefferson had sent an astronomer to learn of the Rio Grande and the Missouri,¹⁷ and had instructed his secretary, "Captain M. Lewis," to visit the latter and to extend his enterprise to the Pacific. The frontier authorities should be warned to stop this expedition. All communication between Spanish and American citizens should be prohibited. He referred to "an individual named Boone," then on the Missouri, as one who should be driven east of the Mississippi. If he and his adherents were permitted to continue their progress westward they would soon be on the high road to Santa Fé. The frontier officials should be empowered to use money in secret service (a characteristic Wilkinson touch!), for in default of this they had just lost a valuable man (perhaps meaning himself!).

¹⁷This refers to Isaac Briggs, who was the surveyor for the district of Mississippi Territory east of the Pearl River. Cf. Jefferson to Briggs, August 11, 1803, *Jefferson Papers, 1st Ser.*, Vol. IX, No. 121, Library of Congress; Wilkinson, *Memoirs*, II, App. LIX.

Before closing Wilkinson emphasized once more the necessity of getting possession of the right bank of the Mississippi. If necessary, Spain should add to the offer of the Floridas a "sum of money which may be convenient to attract the attention of the people and tempt the government of the United States." Spain should even offer to extinguish the existing national debt of some sixty millions. If the Americans were still obdurate the Spaniards should offer a line of demarcation as near as possible to the western bank of the great river, running so as "to cut off the mouth of the Missouri." If necessary the United States might be permitted to control the Fourche mouth of the Mississippi, to prevent contraband trade, while Spain should establish a port at the Teche. In carrying on this most important negotiation the Spanish minister should secure the aid of Americans who were influential with their own government so as to direct its course "as most convenient to the interests of the crown of His Majesty."

It is difficult to find language properly to characterize this proposal. Its blackness may be heightened by suggesting that Wilkinson was probably as ready to betray the Spaniards as the Americans. For the present, however, Folch listened to a part of his proposals, but objected to the cession of the Floridas. He felt that Spain should preserve them and secure as well the right bank of the Mississippi. One would protect Cuba and the other Mexico, but both were necessary for complete defense of the royal dominions. The limits between the two countries must be marked by a natural barrier like the Mississippi (although we should hardly term the river such), consequently the Americans should retain no territory on its western bank. He considered the proposal to extinguish the national debt of the United States in return for this territory as "political heresy." At the utmost Spain should give only the eleven millions the Americans had paid for Louisiana, with the use or possession of New Orleans, adding, if necessary, that part of West Florida between the Pearl and the Mississippi. This would appeal to the parsimony of those Americans who dreaded a war costing far more than this sum, and would likewise show the interest of Spain in preserving peace. With these comments he transmitted Wilkinson's proposal to his superior and recommended the author to royal consideration.

The rumor that the Americans would revive the French claim to

the Rio Grande was a strong reason for Spanish jealousy of their presence. The Indian trader, Davenport, warned Ugarte that the Americans would insist upon this claim. Casa Calvo urged Elguezabal to meet their advances on the Sabine. The general effect of these admonitions was shown in Nimecio Salcedo's orders to keep all foreigners from the Texas frontier and to organize scouting parties to search for possible American intruders. On the other hand, Claiborne emphasized these fears and resulting movements as affording an opportunity to obtain the Floridas by relinquishing all claims beyond the Sabine. This suggestion, in addition to those of similar nature already given by Clark and Dunbar, may have influenced the instructions given to Monroe and Pinckney.¹⁸

The Spaniards of the Internal Provinces had not awaited the formal transfer of Louisiana before taking measures to prevent the inroad of foreigners. Nimecio de Salcedo instructed the Governor of Texas to allow Spanish subjects to remove from Louisiana to Texas, provided they settled far enough from the border to prevent contraband practices. In December, 1803, the viceroy closed his dominions to those who continued to reside in Louisiana. Salcedo forbade any American to approach the disputed frontier. In these orders we note the general dread inspired by the Americans in view of unmarked boundaries and the uncertain allegiance of the Indians.¹⁹

The Americans soon learned the existence of this feeling and uniformly misinterpreted it. In February, 1804, Claiborne reported to Madison that a large Spanish force was marching from Mexico to the province of "Tacus." This movement, the disorder prevalent in certain communities of western Louisiana, and the refusal to hold office under his administration he associated with Spanish fear and jealousy. He insisted still more strongly on this when he heard that the Spanish were strengthening their fortifications at Nacogdoches.²⁰ Just at this time Salcedo informed the

¹⁸Elguezabal to Salcedo, May 9, August 1, October 10, December 19, 1804; Casa Calvo to Elguezabal, March 5, 1804; Ugarte to Elguezabal, October 8, 1804; MSS., *Bezar Archives*. Also Claiborne to Madison, January 24, 1804. *Claiborne Correspondence*. Parker, No. 6919.

¹⁹Salcedo to Viceroy, October 18, 1803, MSS., *Archivo General, Californias*, Vol. 22; Salcedo to Elguezabal, January 18, 19, and May 2, 1804. MSS., *Bezar Archives*.

²⁰Claiborne to Madison, March-June, 1804. Parker, Nos. 6950, 6953, 6995, 6996, 7002.

viceroy that the American commandant, Turner, was constructing a new fort near Natchitoches, so placed as to command the road to Texas.²¹ Thus neither set of frontier officials failed to exhibit an unreasonable jealousy and fear of their opponents.

About the time of the transfer Charles Pinckney, our minister at Madrid, had reported that possibly the Spanish government would send some forces to Pensacola and the Rio Grande. Cevallos denied this rumor and the French and English ministers at the Spanish court expressed a hope that nothing of the sort would take place. But Pinckney persisted in his opinion, for information from other sources apparently confirmed his view. Laussat told Claiborne and Wilkinson that the Spaniards were strengthening their forces on the Texas frontier and would probably encroach upon the disputed territory. The tardy course of the Spaniards in withdrawing from New Orleans gave point to the charge, while other rumors tended to strengthen it.²²

Shortly after, Ugarte, the commandant at Nacogdoches, accompanied by the Natchitoches priest, called upon Captain Turner and endeavored to persuade him to a mutual agreement that no persons should pass their respective frontiers without written permission. Ugarte stated that their interest had been recently aroused by the rumor that a party of Americans had entered the country with evil design and that the Spaniards had been obliged to keep one hundred and fifty soldiers under arms for some time in search of them. The basis for this may have been the report of Ashley's expedition. Turner told Ugarte that well disposed Americans were always free to go where they pleased and that foreigners were allowed free ingress and egress, as far as our territory was concerned. Ugarte, however, urged the matter so strongly that Turner believed his purpose in seeking the interview was simply to learn the ideas of the Americans in order to forestall them. The Spaniard also stated that he had received orders from the captain-general to stop all horse trading. In response to Turner's inquiry about the passports, Claiborne advised Turner to show the friendly disposition of the United States by restraining the horse trade, and, in

²¹Salcedo to Iturrigaray, June 30, 1804. *Archivo General, Provincias Internas*, Vol. 200.

²²Pinckney to Madison, January 23, 1804. MSS., *Spanish Despatches*, VI, Bureau of Indexes and Archives; *Claiborne Correspondence*, II, Parker, No. 6907.

view of the uncertainty about limits, to continue the former custom of issuing passports, at least for the present. Ugarte later informed Turner that he ought to limit the passports to actual residents of his jurisdiction or to such as had absolutely to visit Nacogdoches to collect debts due them from its citizens. Otherwise he had no authority to recognize Louisiana passports.²³

The unfriendly attitude of the Spaniards soon began to manifest itself more distinctly when Ugarte tried to force some settlers in the disputed territory to move away from the frontier into the region west of Nacogdoches. As an instance in point, Turner cited the case of M. Roquier, resident of Natchitoches. The Spanish commandant threatened to confiscate a house and lot that he possessed in Nacogdoches unless he removed thither. Nor could he collect the debts due him unless he fulfilled the same condition. The second threat, it was later explained, was due to the failure of the corn crop for that year. It was subsequently discovered that Roquier was not favorable to the American rule, so he may have originated this rumor to cover up his disaffection. By the end of July, however, all Americans not professing the Catholic faith were ordered out of Texas, and even those permitted to remain must reside west of Nacogdoches. It was reported that this would cause some to remove who had resided twenty-five years in the province, but it hardly seems possible that any American had been there for so long a time.²⁴

Captain Turner also had occasion to report that at one time some Spanish dragoons visited Natchitoches for two days ostensibly to obtain medical treatment from Dr. John Sibley, and that later a Spanish lieutenant came there to purchase supplies; but in both cases they departed without accomplishing their purpose. It was believed that their true intention was to reconnoitre the American fort, with a view to find if any neighboring height commanded it, and to report upon the feasibility of occupying this position. The Spaniards, so it was reported, would first occupy Adaes and then push on towards Natchitoches. From Bayou Pierre came the rumor that a Spanish reinforcement of two hundred at Nacogdoches was designed to accomplish this movement, and Turner was afterward personally informed that detachments to the number of five

²³Turner to Claiborne, May 13, 1804. Parker, No. 6986.

²⁴*Ibid.* Parker, Nos. 7016, 7022.

hundred were to be sent to Adaes and to some point nearer Natchitoches, and that all was in readiness for these troops to march. Alarmed by this he asked to be reinforced by a detachment of artillery and considered the feasibility of ordering Lieutenant Bowmar to join him from the post on the Washita. Claiborne, however, was more fearful of the Spaniards in West Florida than in Texas, and was unwilling to spare any troops from New Orleans. He hardly believed that hostilities would break out, or that in case they did such reinforcements as he could send would be effective. As a matter of fact at this period the viceroy could not spare a hundred militia from Nuevo Leon and Nuevo Santander, and Salcedo had to request aid from Calleja at San Luis Potosi.²⁵

In addition to the fairly specific rumors about fortifying Adaes Turner reported less definite but even more irritating evidences of Spanish unfriendliness. The Spaniards were continually telling the discontented elements in his jurisdiction that the Americans were "mere hogs" who "did not live like Christians," and who would keep the planters poor by heavy taxes. By distorting every trifling circumstance, by searching the papers of all American travelers, and in general observing a course of conduct resembling war, all the Spanish officials, from the general commandant down, were, in his opinion, using "the most despicable means" to show an unfriendly disposition toward the United States and to alienate the affections of the people.²⁶

The Americans had at hand means extremely inadequate to meet the anticipated perils, but fortunately they had also greatly exaggerated the strength of the enemy. In August, 1804, Dr. John Sibley reported that there were sixty men in the American garrison, although more were expected.²⁷ This was at a time when Turner reported the Spanish garrison as five hundred. As to the character of the American soldiers of this garrison we may regard them as equal to the ordinary regulars of that period, and if so, they would compare favorably with their Spanish rivals. Sibley, whose position as an office seeker may render him a prejudiced observer, states that all of the officers at Natchitoches were non-

²⁵*Ibid.* Parker, No. 7026; N. Salcedo to Iturrigaray, February 2, 1804, *Archivo General, Californias*, Vol. 22.

²⁶*Am. State Papers, For. Rel.*, II, 690. Also Turner to Claiborne, July 30, 1804, *Claiborne Correspondence*, II.

²⁷J. Sibley to S. H. Sibley, August 28, 1804. MSS., *Mo. Historical Society*.

Jeffersonians, which is not surprising in view of the President's policy in cutting down the army; and that one "deranged officer at the post," a favorite of the commandant, who monopolized the furnishing of supplies to the garrison, was especially marked by his abuse of the President. In time this practice was bound to have its effect upon the inhabitants, who were beginning to think that the way to political preferment lay through criticism of the government.²⁸

With regard to these inhabitants Turner wrote that in a crisis he believed little dependence could be placed in them, except where their property interests were involved. They were "ignorant almost to stupidity." Accustomed to no system of government but the Spanish, they looked upon another as a "hocus-pocus," destined to make their condition worse. He held out some hope for the future, however, for he added: "When they come to understand the New Government, which, God help them, will be an age I fear, they will be better pleased than they have formerly been." Claiborne also distrusted these same people, although he advised Turner to train them in the militia.²⁹ The events of two years later showed that they possessed an unexpected degree of dependableness.

The situation that involved the property interests of the district had already been created. On July 12, John B. T. Palliet, a former French officer in the Spanish service, now a Natchitoches planter, appeared before Turner and declared under oath that he had seen in the commandant's office at Nacogdoches a royal decree bidding frontier officials use every means in their power to reduce and weaken American control in the neighboring territory. In order to accelerate this process they were to encourage the desertion of slaves and bestow upon the fugitives their freedom, a grant of land, and the services of a priest to instruct them in the Catholic religion.³⁰ This report, which perturbed both Turner and the surrounding population, was supplemented by later rumors that the decree in question had been thrice publicly read, and that the commandant told Samuel Davenport, the Indian trader, that he proposed to enforce it. The people of the Natchitoches district,

²⁸*Jefferson Papers*, 2d Ser., Vol. 76, No. 7.

²⁹Turner to Claiborne, July 12 and 30, 1804. *Claiborne Correspondence*, II.

³⁰*Ibid.* Parker, No. 7014. Such a decree was issued in 1789 with special reference to the Florida border, and had not been repealed.

for forty miles around, then petitioned Turner to police the negroes more vigorously and to forward their petition to Claiborne.³¹ This "ingenuous" action of the Spanish authorities thus promised to act as a two-edged sword, for it disturbed both Spanish sympathizers and loyal Americans.

On receiving Palliet's deposition from Turner, Claiborne was inclined to doubt the report, although he cautioned his subordinate to be watchful. When the petition followed he wrote more definitely. The sequestration of property—for such the decree virtually was—he termed an act of hostility more worthy of a Santo Domingo leader than the King of Spain. He advised the establishment of military patrols in such a way as to cause the least possible alarm. He then reported the matter to Casa Calvo.

The latter believed that the commandant was unauthorized to commit any act of the character alleged, as all his own and Claiborne's advices from Washington pointed to an early definite settlement of the questions at issue between Spain and the United States. When, however, Claiborne quoted from the language of the decree, an offer of "a free and friendly asylum . . . in the dominions of His Catholic Majesty, to such slave or slaves as shall escape from the territories of any foreign power," the latter stated that there must be some awkward mistake and that he had written to Nacogdoches for a copy of the order. He attempted to explain it by saying that it might have been issued during the late war between France and Spain when escaping slaves were to be sold for the benefit of the royal treasury, but that it did not then apply, for it was to the interest of Spain to protect property at Natchitoches.³² This suggestion has a sinister significance, in view of Spanish efforts to regain the territory west of the Mississippi, but Claiborne seems to ignore it, possibly because of his partial sympathy with the idea. Later Casa Calvo reported to Claiborne that Ugarte had written to him, asking for the abrogation of the decree in question. He had not promulgated it, but it was known to some of the French inhabitants of Louisiana, and in some way these had caused the circulation of false reports of its character.

³¹Turner to Claiborne, July 29, 30, and August 3, 1804. *Claiborne Correspondence*, II.

³²Claiborne to Casa Calvo, September 1, 1804; Casa Calvo to Claiborne, September 5, 1804, *Ibid.* Parker, Nos. 7049, 7051.

Such slaves as were in the Natchitoches district had been introduced there during Spanish rule, so his government had the moral responsibility of preserving that form of property, under whatever government the region should have.³³

By this time, however, the question had become something more than a mere theory. On October 14 it was discovered that the negroes on one of the plantations near Natchitoches planned to escape into Spanish territory. Nine of them did, indeed, break into a house, take powder, lead and horses, and make off beyond the Sabine, despite all efforts to recapture them. Another negro, who was wounded by a patrol, turned informer, and implicated some thirty others. Some of these had attempted to escape, but had returned to learn why the others did not follow. The informer implicated two white men, one of whom was a Spaniard named Martinez, as the agents who had stirred up the negroes to attempt this flight.³⁴ The successful escape of nine, due apparently to Spanish influence, enraged the population of Natchitoches, and the wilder spirits asked Turner's permission to attack Nacogdoches, if the fugitives were not immediately delivered to them. Turner assured them that he had already requested Ugarte to do this, and succeeded in temporarily pacifying them; but he realized the significance of this readiness to attack the Spaniards. The spirit of the Mississippi was already transferred to the Sabine.

Within a fortnight Claiborne learned of this event and lost no time in communicating the facts to Casa Calvo, and in suggesting to Colonel Butler that he should move the American troops from Attakapas and Opelousas to Natchitoches. To Turner he expressed his regret and advised a careful maintenance of the patrol. Then ensued a vigorous controversy between Claiborne and Casa Calvo. The latter censured the French inhabitants of the disturbed district for their indiscretion in making the proclamation known and thus indirectly inciting their slaves, but Claiborne threw the blame on the commandant at Nacogdoches. Casa Calvo favored the return of the slaves on condition that they be well treated, but Claiborne insisted upon their unconditional surrender. The upshot of the matter was that Casa Calvo assumed the responsibility of

³³Casa Calvo to Claiborne, November 6, 1805, *Ibid.* Parker, No. 7102.

³⁴Turner to Claiborne, October 16, 17, 1804, *Ibid.* Parker, Nos. 7080, 7082.

bidding Ugarte return the slaves and suspend the decree until he could hear from Spain. This was finally done.

Later, Casa Calvo reported that his course met with the approval of his government, but Turner stated that Salcedo suspended Ugarte for carrying out this suggestion and instructed his successor to execute the decree. Claiborne, however, managed to secure from Casa Calvo a reiteration of his position in this matter. In reporting the affair to his government, Casa Calvo stated that he had tried to quiet Claiborne by suggesting that the *cedula* did not refer to the Americans, but to the French, with whom the Spaniards were at war when it was issued.³⁵ The incident is significant of the influence which the latter wielded, despite the fact that the American government refused to acknowledge his position as boundary commissioner, and that his fellow officials in Florida and the Internal Provinces were jealous of his power and did their best to hamper him in his efforts to carry out his task. The incident aroused also other portions of Orleans Territory, particularly Point Coupeé. The slaves of this region had formerly revolted under Spanish rule and were now reported as restive, owing to the tidings from Natchitoches.

On November 10, 1804, Casa Calvo addressed a communication to Nimecio Salcedo, in which he expressed his belief that the royal order of 1789 must be modified by the retrocession of Louisiana. He mentioned Claiborne's complaint in August, the recent escape of slaves in Natchitoches, and the report of disturbances at Point Coupeé as evidencing the necessity of suspending the order until they could learn His Majesty's latest determination. Accordingly he had requested Ugarte to do so and he hoped this would meet with Salcedo's approval.³⁶

A few days before this Ugarte had received a testimonial from certain officials and citizens of Natchitoches stating that his course had foiled the negro insurrection and thanking him warmly as the benefactor of their country. On two separate occasions Ugarte had likewise employed his troops to secure and return parties of escaping negroes.³⁷ When Ugarte received Casa

³⁵*Ibid.* Parker, Nos. 7097-7103, 7107, 7186, 7190, 7260.

³⁶Casa Calvo to (Salcedo) and to Ugarte, November 10, 1804. MSS., *Archivo General, Provincias Internas*, Vol. 200.

³⁷Sindicos and Major of Militia to Ugarte, November 14, 1804; Salcedo to Governor of Texas, January 23, 1805, *Ibid.*

Calvo's complaint and request he felt hurt at the implied reflection upon his conduct. He defended himself vigorously against the charge of inciting a slave insurrection across the border and protested that all reports of this character were malicious falsehoods. He sent the testimonial describing his real services and requested some means of defending himself from "the assertions of frontier vagabonds and peddlers of news."³⁸ He was very likely right in thus characterizing those who had defamed him. It was the policy of such traders as Davenport, who enjoyed special privileges under the Spaniards, to prevent cordial relations between the latter and the Americans, and others like Palliet may have assisted them for personal reasons.

Salcedo, however, was greatly incensed against the Americans because of their activity in exploring their new acquisition and in establishing relations with the Indians, and was not inclined to favor his inquiet neighbors. He thought that Ugarte's defense ought to allay Governor Claiborne's fears, but regarded himself as without authority to suspend the decree. He advised the Governor or Texas to detain all fugitive slaves until he could learn the King's will, or at least the opinion of Don Pedro Grimarest, the recently appointed chief of the Eastern Interior Provinces.³⁹ Under the Treaty of 1795 the United States could ask nothing more and he requested the viceroy to express his own opinion and to aid him in every way possible, until Grimarest should arrive.⁴⁰

Notwithstanding his uncertainty in regard to international relations Salcedo maintained very strict ideas of discipline. Ugarte may have prevented a border war, but in doing so he had violated the letter of his instructions. Salcedo therefore suspended the unfortunate official and ordered him to Bexar, where the Governor of Texas was to examine his conduct carefully. Ugarte must explain why he had permitted a militia captain to visit Natchitoches and to be present at the transfer of that post to the Americans; why he had on two occasions employed his troops to capture and return fugitive slaves to Louisiana; and how he reconciled such deeds with

³⁸Ugarte to Salcedo, December 26, 1804. *Ibid.*

³⁹This was the recently created jurisdiction that had been formed from a part of his own dominions with the addition of Nuevo Leon and Nuevo Santander. Grimarest, however, never assumed the command.

⁴⁰Salcedo to Iturrigaray, January 23, 1805. *Ibid.*

a strict compliance with his duties.⁴¹ Evidently Ugarte was not able to clear himself of fault, for another commandant took charge of Nacogdoches.

Salcedo suggested to Casa Calvo that the course of the American government since taking possession of Louisiana had been sufficiently unfriendly to neutralize all of their complaints in regard to escaping slaves. The Lewis and Clark expedition and similar undertakings since projected by Jefferson, and the various attempts to tamper with the allegiance of the Indians would abundantly justify precautionary or retaliatory measures on the part of the Spaniards. Despite his lack of resources to meet these dangers he had succeeded in sending fifty men from Coahuila into Texas and he advised the governor of that province to strengthen secretly the garrison at Nacogdoches by sending forward a few men with each convoy of mail and bidding them remain there.⁴² At the same time Casa Yrujo was explaining to Jefferson at his Monticello home that any frontier movements could only be intended for defense in view of the European situation. The President agreed with him that it was necessary to receive such reports and others relating to escaping slaves with great circumspection and forbear to increase forces or in other ways change the existing situation.⁴³

⁴¹*Ibid.*

⁴²*Ibid.*; also Salcedo to Casa Calvo, January 22, 1805.

⁴³Casa Yrujo to Cevallos, October 26, 1804. *Adams Transcripts, Spanish State Papers*, Bureau of Rolls and Library. Robertson, No. 5007.

EXTRACTS FROM THE DIARY OF W. Y. ALLEN,
1838-1839¹

EDITED BY WILLIAM S. RED

Wednesday, March 28th, 1838. Arrived at Galveston in the Schooner *Johannes*, about noon, after a smooth voyage from New Orleans. No horrors of seasickness. Find a good harbor and a beautiful bay. Galveston is a very small town, but likely to grow owing to its location. Met with Judge Underwood and Colonel [P. W.] Grayson, both from Kentucky, the latter from Bardstown, from whom I received marked attention, and to whom I owe lasting gratitude.

Friday, March 30th. Left Galveston on the *S. B. Friend*, with a number of passengers from Houston. Passed San Jacinto Battle Ground, of which we had a good view from the deck of the steamer. Met on board Prof. Yates of Union College, New York, a very pleasant gentleman.

Saturday, March 31st. Arrived at Houston at 8 a. m. Delivered letters, took lodgings at Madam Milon's. Had a sofa for a bed. Made several agreeable acquaintances.

Sabbath, April 1st. Preached three times this day in the Capi-

¹Rev. William Y. Allen was born near Shelbyville, Kentucky, May 7, 1805. He was of Scotch-Irish ancestry. His early education was obtained in the "old field schools" of his early youth. At the age of twenty-one he commenced the study of law with Singleton Wilson of Kentucky. At the age of twenty-four he made a profession of faith and commenced to study for the ministry. He was graduated from Centre College, in 1832, and taught in that institution for two and one-half years, studying theology under Dr. Young. He spent one year at Princeton Seminary. He labored for a short time in Pennsylvania and then in Alabama, from whence he came to Texas. After laboring four years in Texas, at his own expense, he returned to Kentucky, and from thence went to Rockville, Indiana, where he was pastor for fourteen years. Thereafter, he labored as a missionary until the time of his death, which occurred at Rockville, Indiana, February 13, 1885. Mr. Allen came to Texas March 28, 1838, and finally left the Republic February 17, 1842. Thus his experiences cover four years of the early history of the Republic, when most men were too busy making history to have time for preserving a record of the events. During that time he made four trips to the United States: for the purpose of being ordained (September 10 to October 22, 1838); to recuperate (January, 1840); to get married (July, 1840), and to collect funds for a church building (February, 1841). But he was actually in the Republic about three years, and his position of chaplain to the congress of the Republic, Senate and House in succession, brought him into such relation

tol to large and respectful audiences. There had been no preaching for a long time.

Monday, April 2nd. Met the Misses Humphries, old Kentucky acquaintances. Removed my quarters to Woodruff's near the old graveyard. Mr. W. is a Baptist brother, and I boarded with him for some time, he charging me only half price. Several members of Congress were fellow boarders: General Burleson of the number and W. Fairfax Gray, Clerk of the Senate.

Sabbath, April 8th. Preached twice in the Capitol to good congregations. About 1 p. m., much noise, firing of cannon and parade, on the occasion of the arrival of General Houston, President of the Republic.

Monday, April 9th. Solemnized a marriage of Col. E. A. Rhoades of New Orleans, and Mrs. Mary W. Driggs, of this City. Only two gentlemen present as witnesses. My first marriage ceremony in Texas. Members of Congress arriving, introduced to several of them.

Tuesday, April 10th. Introduced to President Houston; found him very courteous. A princely looking man. The Presidential Mansion a very unpretentious cottage. Took tea with Mr. Sanderson and family.

Wednesday, April 11th. Invited to officiate temporarily as Chaplain of the Senate, Lamar presiding. Offered prayer at the

to men and events as to make his experiences and observations interesting to every student of the history of Texas whether of the State or of the Church.

Extracts from his Diary, which are here reprinted, appeared in various issues of the *Texas Presbyterian* from March, 1880, to December, 1883. The extracts cover two brief periods—March 28 to December 2, 1838, and October 1 to October 14, 1839. It seems that Mr. Allen furnished the editor extracts from his Diary, now and then making comments at the time they were furnished for publication. Search has been made in vain to locate the original manuscript, and it is, therefore, not known whether the following pages contain all of his Diary. Before the publication of the Diary, Mr. Allen had been contributing reminiscences to the *Texas Presbyterian*, and these reminiscences, continuing from December 4, 1876, until January 2, 1885, will appear in future issues of THE QUARTERLY. At the time that these contributions were running, the *Texas Presbyterian* was edited in Texas, but issued from St. Louis. Only two files of the paper are known to be in existence, both in the library of Austin College at Sherman.

The entries of the Diary from March 28 to December 2, 1838, are printed in the *Presbyterian* of March 19, April 16 and 30, May 7, August 6 and 20, September 3, October 8 and 29, and December 31, 1880; March 4 and December 23, 1881; and March 31, 1882. The entries from October 1 to 14, 1839, are in the issues for January 26, June 29, and December 14, 1883.

opening of the session. (This was the adjourned session of the first [second] Congress.) Witnessed the conclusion of a treaty, at the President's house, between the Republic and several chiefs of the Tonkaway Indians. The President in full military uniform, several officers of state, about ten chiefs, and a number of spectators, present. The articles of the treaty were read to the chiefs in the Mexican language, Welshmeyer interpreting, to which three chiefs attached their marks, several officers and spectators present also signed it as witnesses. After the formalities, General Houston made a speech to the Indians, a good deal, I suppose, like most talks to Indians on similar occasions. Then, one of the chiefs made a talk; some of the chiefs had but little clothing; all had painted faces. They seemed awkward with pen.

Saturday, April 14th. An address to both Houses of Congress by General Houston, at the close of which a fight in front of the Capitol and a murder in the afternoon, in a saloon. The murderer and murdered both heroes of San Jacinto,—rum's doings.

Sabbath, April 15th. Three services today. Rev. Littleton Fowler, Chaplain of the House, preached twice: preached at 7:30 p. m.; text, Deut. 7:9-10, God faithful and covenant keeping, etc. More freedom than usual in speaking.

Monday, April 16th. Met Lieut. Tod, late of the United States Navy, afterwards superintended the building of the five war schooners of the Texas Navy. He is a Presbyterian. I knew his father's family in Kentucky: good people.

One of the rioters of Saturday, Mr. L., brought to the bar of the Senate, charged, heard and acquitted. The other, Col. W., arraigned in the afternoon, and reprimanded by Vice-President Lamar. The Col. seemed quite indignant at the proceedings of the Senate. *O tempora!* etc.

Wednesday, April 18th. Attended the funeral of Mr. Doby, late of Virginia, a merchant of this city. Funeral at Harrisburg: Chaplain Fowler preached. I followed with a few remarks. Mr. D. was a young man much respected.

Friday, April 20th. Was elected Chaplain of the House of Representatives; competitors, an Episcopal clergyman, and a Catholic priest of infamous character.

Sabbath, April 22nd. Three services today: first, by Brother

Alexander of Mississippi, of the M. E. Church; second, by myself; and third, by Chaplain Fowler. Good congregations.

Tuesday, April 24th. Commenced a sermon on Is. 12:21 "Produce your cause."

Wednesday, April 25th. Finished the sermon. Met with Bro. Ralls, a Cumberland Presbyterian, from Louisiana. The brothers, James and Clark Owen, and self took tea with the Humphries, all of us Kentuckians and old acquaintances.

Sabbath, April 29th. A shower, thunder and lightening. Preached from Mal. 3:16-17: considerable liberty in speaking on the duty and encouragements of Christian conversation. Preached in the evening from Is. 41:21.

Tuesday, May 3rd, 1838. After service in the House of Representatives, called on Mrs. Bee, a lady from Charleston, S. C., late of Pendleton. Found her an interesting, intelligent, and pious lady, a subject of recent severe domestic affliction. What a charm does unaustentatious piety throw around the character of an accomplished woman. Then, we behold religion in its loveliness and woman in her loveliness, when the hand of God is recognized as the hand of a father, sanctifying bereavement.

At 8 p. m., went to the Hall to hear a Bro. Campbell, of the M. E. Church, but had to preach myself. Preached from Acts 9:6.

Last night sat up late writing a communication to the Western Presbyterian Herald on the prospects and condition of Texas.

Friday, May 4th. Saw many members of Congress, President Houston and Bowles, a famous Cherokee chief, embark on the steamer Friend for Galveston. Fear they will not do much honor to the country by such a visit under such circumstances.

Sabbath, May 6th. Met the friends and children of a proposed Sabbath School, at 9 a. m. Took the names of the children and addressed them and their friends on the importance of such an institution. Encouraged by the prospect of success.

At 10 a. m., a sermon by Bro. Campbell of the M. E. Church, a newly arrived missionary for this new field. May he have come in the fullness of the blessing of the Gospel of Christ, and be abundantly blessed in his efforts to honor the Master and benefit souls.

At 8 p. m. preached to a large and very attentive audience from 2 Cor. 11:15, a solemn subject. How little do I feel it

importance! Lord what is man? Pardon my unworthiness, and bless thy truth!

May 7th, 1838. My 33rd birthday, and what, though I am in a strange land and among strangers, yet am I not led by the same hand that has always led me! Am I not still among the children of my father, many of them wayward, but may I not hope that even here among these scattered ones the Lord has much people, whom in due time He will bring into the fold of the good Shepherd, and may I be the means of recalling some of them to the care of the Shepherd and Bishop of Souls! In looking over the last as well as former years, may I well say "Bless the Lord, O my soul!"

Thursday, May 10th. Preached in the Hall, at 8 p. m., from Ps. 84:11. Remained awhile to practice sacred music.

Friday, May 11th. A company met to spend an hour in singing, apparently interested. Hope it will do good if kept up.

Saturday, May 12th. Called at an early hour, by Mr. B. to go and see a dying woman. Found her revived, but to all appearance she had been and was still near to death and judgment. She seemed utterly unprepared; no sense of sin or of danger from the justice and holiness of God. Of course, no perception of the character of the Savior. Oh! It is a sad thought that the first impressions of these great truths might have been and probably will be flashed into her soul by the light of eternity. Oh! Immortal spirit! Whither goest thou without the light of the glorious Gospel: to happiness or misery, or annihilation? Who can tell without the Bible? And she does not profess to believe the Bible. Conversed a short time with her about the danger of being deceived, and the importance of religion in affliction, especially in a dying hour, with but little apparent effect. Said she had never done any harm, had never been very wild, showing that she knew nothing of "the plague of her heart." Prayed with her, I fear with little faith. She seemed thankful for my call. May the spirit of life quicken and enlighten her dark mind!

9 p. m. The above prayer I find to have been for the dead. The woman died about the time the above was written.

Thursday, May 17th. Preached at 8 p. m. to a large audience in the Hall from 2 Sam'l, 17:14, not much liberty.

May 18th. p. m. Met with a few persons to sing, many spec-

tators. At the close, a young man, a Mr. M., from Boston, living twenty miles in the country introduced himself; had not heard a sermon until last evening, since he came to the country last summer, an Episcopalian.

Sabbath, May 20th. Attended Sabbath School, which had been organized the previous Sabbath, the 13th of May, 1838,—probably the first Sabbath School ever organized in Texas. It was “a day of small things.” The school was commenced with twenty-six pupils, with few books, very miscellaneous, and a few teachers extemporized. (Nineteen years afterward there were six schools some of them large.)

On this second Sabbath a few new scholars, few teachers. At 10 a. m., preaching by Chaplain Fowler on the resurrection of Christ; a glorious theme and well managed. If Christ be not raised our faith is vain, we are yet in our sins, for then there is no satisfaction for our sins on which we can rely. But one service today, more rain today and tonight than I have seen in Texas.

S. S. Barnett accosted me, *a tergo*, in the street yesterday; an old friend and fellow student in Centre College. Spent but little time with him, as he was hurrying home to Kentucky. Was informed, later in the evening, of the sickness of a Mr. Brent, of Virginia; promised to call upon him in the morning.

Monday, May 21st. Called to see Mr. B., about 12 m.; found only the lifeless body. He had died during the night. Seemed much emaciated. Don't know what were his principles or habits. I went to see a sick man, hoping to do something for his soul. his spirit had fled, the clay only was left. He died in a poor dirty hospital in Texas. He was of the Lees of Virginia. “God is no respecter of persons.”

Thursday, May 24th. The first [second] Congress of the Republic adjourned today, at 1 p. m., after an address by President Houston. Hall crowded. A good address; spoke severely of the treatment of the Indians, the severity of truth. Received for services as Chaplain \$180.00 promissory notes.

Friday, May 25th. Members of Congress scattering, among them my fellow boarders, General Burleson, Anson Jones and Wharton.

Performed funeral service at the interment of one Rogers, a

Cherokee half-breed, who died in the city after a short illness, a large man, said to have been quite intelligent.

Saturday, May 26th. This day about thirty Comanche Indians came into town, a delegation from their tribe to make a treaty with Texas. There were men and squaws and young children; all rode astride; generally very dirty and ill-looking. They paraded in some state before the President's mansion.

Sabbath, May 27th. Preached three times in the Capitol.

May 28th. Visited the camp of the Comanches near the city; saw the pipe of peace smoked by a Comanche and Cushatta Chief; the pipe was smoked, the ashes deposited with due ceremony, and ribs of roast beef brought on and passed around, the members of the Council each cutting off a bite. In the mean time two fat squaws were occupied looking at each other's heads and—bah!

Wednesday, May 30th. Took passage on the S. B. Friend for Galveston, where I had landed more than two months previous. A pleasant company; tremendous rains soon after leaving Houston; no special incident on the way down.

Thursday, May 31st. Arrived at Galveston about 9 a. m.; received with much courtesy by the Commandants of the Navy and the Navy Yard; entertained by them and invited to preach in a room connected with the Navy Yard; sea breeze delightful also the bathing in the Gulf.

Friday, June 1st, 1838. Read part of the life of John Newton.

Sabbath, June 3rd. Preached at the Navy Yard, 10:30 a. m.; said to have been the second Protestant sermon ever preached on the Island. At 5 p. m. preached on the old war brig Potomac, and at 8 p. m. at the Navy Yard—a good congregation in the morning. Considerable interest manifested by some to have regular preaching. Nearly devoured by mosquitoes at night.

Tuesday, June 5th. Returned to Houston at 7 a. m. in the Friend. A letter from my brother; a welcome message from dear ones at home.

Sabbath, June 10th. Preached twice this day; much liberty at evening service, spoke from Job 21:15; a falling off in the size of the congregation as the weather gets warmer.

Prospects of the Sabbath School encouraging this morning. At 8 p. m. performed a marriage ceremony for John T. Randall and Sarah Davenport, at the house of Mr. Sanderson, only two

witnesses present besides the family—my second marriage service in Texas.

Monday, June 11th. Prepared to set off for Galveston, where I arrived Tuesday, 12th, at 11 a. m. Made some visits; heard a lecture on "Light" by Dr. L.; slept at the Navy Yard; ate no breakfast.

Wednesday, June 13th. Missed my dinner. Kindly invited to stay with Mr. G. Borden (who proved a true friend during all my stay in Texas²); a good drink of ice water on the Cuba.

Friday, June 15th. Spent the afternoon in opening and distributing a box of Bibles and Testaments, one hundred of each in the box; a donation from the A. B. Society. May the Holy Spirit, whose sword the word is, guide in its distribution. May He incline many to inquire at the Word of the Lord and prepare many hearts to receive and understand it, and "make it indeed the power of God unto their salvation." And may the people of Texas find the Word of God a shield and a defense, and in His name may they set up their banners. For "blessed is the people," and only they "whose God is the Lord."

Sabbath, June 17th. Preached in the Navy Yard; a rather different sermon from so good a text—"Now is Christ risen"; small congregation; weather getting warm. Afternoon services interrupted by the arrival of Genel M. Hunt, Sec. of the Navy, and the firing of a salute. How prone are men to pay honors to one another! How reluctant to honor the Son of Man!

Monday, June 18th. Had a long conversation today with a professed Deist; said he believed in one God, that he loved and worshiped him, that he admired the Bible for its morality, etc. He admitted that he did not wish his children brought up in the principles of Deism. I fear he is trying to believe a lie.

Tuesday, June 19th. Had a long talk with an eccentric man, who thinks he has made some singular discoveries in relation to the plan of salvation, faith, etc. I rather suspect him of egotism, inclined to Campbellism. He seems to like to hear himself talk. A Deist one day, a Campbellite the next: what various experiences!

Wednesday, June 20th. Wrote letter to Rev. W. L. Breckenridge, to Bailly of New Orleans, McMullen of Ala. Received letters from McMullen and Holman of Alabama. (Postage was then

²This is obviously a later addition to the diary.

.25 from any place in the United States to New Orleans and .12½ from New Orleans to Texas.³)

While I lived in Alabama, I met with Brother Holman, who gave me this piece of History bearing on the Baptist idea of close communion. He said he was traveling in a new part of the country and fell in at a Baptist meeting on a Saturday. The Brethren having no preacher had met in Church meeting. They requested him to preach for them. He did so to the delight of the brethren. After preaching, they held a consultation and concluded to ask him to preach for them on the Sabbath and administer the communion to them, as they had not had a communion for a long time. That they would receive it from him on the condition that he would not partake of it himself, and that he complied with their request. "Alas! poor human nature!" as Bro. Daniel Baker used to say.

Friday, June 22nd, 1838. Have heard some circumstances today in relation to the Texan struggle for independence, which illustrates the Scripture declaration that "the proud shall be brought low," as also the doctrine of a special providence.

Lorenzo De Zavala was one of the first men to detect and denounce the intrigues of Santa Anna against the liberties of the Mexican people. Zavala was Foreign Minister, for Mexico, at the court of France. Perceiving, at a very early period, the designs of Santa Anna, to overthrow the Mexican Constitution, Zavala offered his resignation, which was refused by President Santa Anna. Zavala soon after resigned and came to New York and thence to Texas, and told the people that they must set up for themselves, for which he incurred the displeasure of many of the people of Texas, for but few of them had begun to suspect Santa Anna. Zavala continued to urge the necessity of breaking off from the confederacy. A price was soon set upon his head by the Mexican Government, at whose head was Santa Anna, or rather he was the Government. The party of Zavala continued to increase until it finally triumphed at the battle of San Jacinto, and President Santa Anna was captured—in *cog*—by some of the common soldiers and brought into the camp of General Houston, to whom he made himself known by name, claiming his protection as a prisoner of war, and this in sight of De Zavala's house

³A later addition to the diary.

which stood on the opposite shore of the bay, to that on which the battle was fought. Thus was the proud humbled.

General Cos, about the time of the siege of San Antonio de Bexar, offered a reward for the capture of one, Smith, called Deaf Smith, a famous spy, a very adventurous, daring man, and who had been of great service to the Texans. After the battle of San Jacinto, Cos was overtaken in his flight, near the Brazos, by the same Smith, who rode up and told him that he had brought Smith's head, for which he (Cos) had offered a reward, and that he (Smith) now claimed the reward. But, instead of handing over the money, he dismounted and fell upon his knees, begging for his life. He probably thought, at the moment, that his own head was not worth a picayune. He, too, was brought back a prisoner to the camp of General Houston, to join the equally unfortunate and humbled Santa Anna.

A singular infatuation seems to have possessed Santa Anna, at the time of the commencement of the battle of San Jacinto, on the 21st of March [April] 1836. It was soon after dinner. He had lain down to take his Siesta. An officer observed that Houston's 700 were in motion, urged the necessity of watching their motions. Santa Anna told him there was no danger and not to disturb him. The officer insisted that there was danger, for he saw the Texans advancing. Santa Anna ridiculed the idea, telling him that he had not forgotten the affair of San Antonio. But before they knew what they were about, the Texans came rushing upon them with the battle cry, "Remember the Alamo!" The Mexicans had no time to form. A panic siezed them and ten thousand [?] were vanquished by the 700. Santa Anna had only time to mount his horse and take to flight, leaving his poor soldiers to fall into the hands of the infuriated Texans, on the beautiful plain, while many rushed into the bay and sank into the mire. Verily there is a God that ruleth among the nations! O that men would acknowledge and fear him. . . .

Sabbath, July 1st, 1838. Preached three times in the Capitol today: First, from Mark 2:27, on the Sabbath; second, at 5 p. m., on Ps. 23rd; at 8 p. m., on Hebrews 2:3, miracles prove the Bible true. During the sermon, was interrupted by a drunken man coming into the hall. He was soon taken out but continued

to interrupt us by making a noise in the passage. How much like a brute is a drunken man!

Monday, July 2nd. Held monthly concert in the Capitol. A goodly number present. Meeting interesting. Contributions \$18.00, Col. W. giving \$10.00.

Wednesday, July 4th. Saw a delegation of Tonkawa Indians, about twenty-five. Many nearly naked. They stopped at the President's house, where they were received by the Secretaries of State and War. They were treated to whisky punch, noise, drinking and fighting towards evening. And this is the fourth of July. "*Necate virtute Puer,*" and what will our Government come to!

Thursday, July 5th. Lectured this evening on Judges 18th, Micah's idolatry. Small audience. Saw a man this morning, a victim of intemperance, brought to his death by yesterday's excesses. A copious rain this afternoon; much needed as there had been none for a month. How good is the Lord, who "sendeth his rain on the just and on the unjust." He "filleteth the hearts of His creatures with food and gladness."

The Tonkawa Indians are, many of them, finely formed. Most of the men of the present delegation to Houston are almost entirely naked. All the costume of some of them is a long narrow strip of cloth passed between the legs, and held up before and behind by a string or a band around the lower part of the body. Some have an old blanket, some an old skirt, others a pair of leggings, mockasins, etc. Some of the women have a piece of leather or dressed buffalo skin fastened around the waist. Some, an additional piece around the shoulders. Some of the younger females have tinkling ornaments fastened to the lower part of their leather costumes. The men paint their faces hideously, wear their hair long, dressed with shining trinkets, some with large plaits of adscitious hair or cloth hanging down to the knees. Their language a grunting jargon. They seem cheerful, sing considerably. Such singing as it is. They seem fond of whiskey, some of them terribly drunk. They are a much better looking people than the Comanches. They are much demoralized by intercourse with the whites, learning their worst vices readily.

Sabbath, July 8th. Preached twice, good congregations.

Wednesday, July 11th. Set off on the steamer Correo for Galveston. Intensely hot, felt badly from loss of sleep, having sat

up all night with Dr. G.'s dying child. While some were watching the flickering life of the young immortal, many were enjoying the stage, and indulging in the loud unseemly roar of vulgar applause. How ungratifyingly did these sounds come upon the souls of the anguished parents! Surely the tender mercies of the wicked are cruel.

Thursday, July 12th. Found some sickness on the Island.

Friday, July 13th. Half sick all day.

Sabbath, July 15th. Preached in Galveston.

Monday, July 16th. Took the little steamer *Laura*, after night, for Velasco, but few passengers, a family from Virginia, named Stubblefield.

Tuesday, July 17th. A squall this morning, pretty rough for the little steamer, several cases of seasickness, a little qualm myself, but escaped. Arrived in Velasco, 2 p. m. Called on Mr. Sharpe, found a pleasant family, was introduced to Daddy Spraggins, a Hardshell Baptist preacher. Took lodgings at his son-in-law's Brown, who kept the Velasco hotel. Spent the remainder of the week there rather pleasantly. Had a fierce encounter with Dr. A. an openly avowed Deist and materialist.

Arise, O Lord! for men condemn thy character and make void thy law. Had divers discussions with the Old Hard Shell about Missionaries, whom he cordially detested, as well as benevolent societies, baptism. He seemed to consider himself infallible on all these subjects.

Sabbath, July 22nd. Preached in the school house in Velasco, a small but attentive audience. Text, Mat. 5:13, Let your light shine. Dined with the Sharpes. The steamer *Columbia* arrived from New Orleans, via Galveston, on which Dr. Anson Jones took passage, on his way to Washington City, appointed by President Houston to represent Texas in a public capacity, vice General M. Hunt. During this visit made acquaintances in Velasco and Quintana on the opposite side of the Brazos both near the mouth of the river.

Monday, July 23rd. Set off for Houston on Dr. Jones' horse, which he left at Velasco, as this would give me a chance to see some of the country, in company with Brewster, who took me and introduced me to the family of Col. Wm. H. Wharton, who lives eight miles from Velasco. Very kindly entertained by Mrs. W.

and Miss C. Plenty of figs, the first that I had ever seen fresh, and melons. A most delightful situation, a fine garden on the margin of a beautiful little lake.

Tuesday, July 24th. Rode twenty-five miles to Col. W. D. Hall's, most of the way over a hot prairie; passed lake Jackson, four or five miles long, but narrow, after crossing Oyster creek; saw a tree loaded with fine looking grapes, villainously sour and acrid, well called cut-throats. Stopped a while at Hon. Mr. Russell's, Senator from Brazoria, whose wife was a Heady, a family I had known in Kentucky. Plenty of good grapes and figs here. Received very kindly by Col. Hall and family, figs and peaches, good shade and water. Met Col. W. H. Wharton and Col. Wm. Austin and lady, pleasant acquaintances.

Wednesday, July 25th. Spent the day at Col. H.'s much talk of politics, education, etc.

Thursday, July 26th. Set off at 8.30 for Houston, twenty-five or thirty miles distant, prairie nearly all the way and hot. A bowl of buttermilk after riding six miles, at Clear lake, then got lost, fifteen miles without water, found it good at Dr. Rose's. Dined at Bingham's, met Thornton today. Arrived in Houston before sunset. Surely I may say "Mercy and goodness have followed me all my days," and now I have seen some of the country of Texas and it is beautiful.

Saturday, July 28th, 1838. Newspapers today. A welcome arrival: W. P. Herald from Louisville, New Orleans Observer, Alabama Journal. Observed the notices of the debates of several acquaintances. What shadows we are.

Sabbath, July 29th. Attended Sabbath School, a good many children, but few teachers, preached at 10:30 from Acts 9:4, at 8 p. m., on prophecy.

Monday, July 30th. Called to see General Sheldon, just before he expired. He was unable to converse. Had been very reluctant to admit the idea of dying, thought he was getting better until near the last.

Tuesday, July 31st. Attended the funeral of General Sheldon, funeral services at the grave. Wrote an article for the "Civilian," on the neglected state of the Houston Cemetery.

Sabbath, Aug. 5th. Preached twice in the Capitol, from Ro. I:28 and Deut. 32:31.

Monday, Aug. 6th. Letters from R. W. W. Wright, R. B. McMullen, Thos. S. Withersoop, and E. O. Eastman and New Orleans Observer. Met Dr. Axon, an old friend.

Friday, Aug. 24th. Galveston. Have been sick now for two weeks, part of the time as sick as I ever was in my life; four or five chills, the first I ever had, all followed by severe fevers; have had the kindest attention from Gail Borden and family, for which may the Lord reward them abundantly, and may I never forget their kindness, nor the Lord's mercy in raising me up from a sick bed. This was my first sickness in the South.

Sabbath, Aug. 26th. Rode down to the bay early. Preached in the Temporary Court Room to a small audience, from Acts 11:26. Much exhausted and still weak, dined in the hotel, met Mrs. Newell and her sister, Miss Haff, felt much better in the evening.

Monday, Aug. 27th. Quite well this morning.

Thursday, Aug. 30th. Off for Houston on the San Jacinto. Regret to hear of the death of Mrs. Davenport, a short illness.

Sabbath, Sept. 2nd. Preached at 10:30 from Mat. 8:32; at 7:30 from Heb. 11:34. Good congregations.

Monday, Sept. 3rd, 1838. Day of general election. Much sin of profaneness and intemperance. General Lamar elected President. Attended the funeral of Mr. Kennicott, a young lawyer, late of New Orleans. Read part of the Episcopal burial service and offered prayer at the house where he died. Four burials this day. "So teach us to number our days."

Tuesday and Wednesday. Read sketches of Persia. (Now in 1880, I have a daughter a missionary in Persia.)

Soon after a severe sickness, which kept me at Galveston some two weeks—chills and severe fevers. I left Houston for Alabama, to attend the South Alabama Presbytery, under whose care I had been as a licentiate, since the fall of 1837. I left Houston in the *Correo*, on the 7th of September. A large company of passengers called at Col. Morgan's.

Saturday, Sept. 8th. I arrived at Galveston after dark. The water of the Bay was considerably up in the city, all around the old Customhouse, where I was landed in a small boat. From there I had to wade some 150 to 200 yards to dry land. Found my

way to Gail Borden's where I had received so much kindness while I was sick.

Monday, 10th Sept. On the steamer Columbia. Came near being left on account of the fog. There was no wharf then at Galveston. Arrived at New Orleans, on Wednesday 12th, without any adventure.

Saturday, Sept. 15th. Took passage in the steamer Pawnee, for Natchez, at 11 p. m.

Monday night, Sept. 17th. Toiled up the long dark muddy hill, to the City Hotel, with my Texas companion, Mr. Ayres.

Tuesday, Sept. 18th. Met a kind welcome to the house of Mr. Thomas Henderson. Met this day with the Presbytery of Mississippi. Here were brethren Winchester, pastor of Natchez Church, and Chamberlain, President of Oakland College, who had been the first President of Centre College, Ky., and Z. Butler of Port Gibson, and Chase, and I. J. Henderson, whom I had left in Princeton in 1836. Preached for Bro. Winchester, Wednesday night, and on Sabbath for Bro. I. J. Henderson at Kingston, near the grave of Dr. T. Dwight's father. After a pleasant week at Natchez, returned to New Orleans, and thence to Montgomery Alabama, where I spent a Sabbath, then the next Sabbath at a campmeeting in Coosa, above Witumpka, where I met with Bros. Holman and Caldwell, Kentuckians and Centre College students, and McCormick, a North Carolinian. It was a good campmeeting.

Wednesday, Oct. 17th, 1838. Wound up my affairs in Montgomery, packed my books and traps and shipped them for Mobile, and set off with Gulick, for Presbytery, at Valley Creek Church, near Selma; arrived on Friday at 12 m. Found Bro. Nall preaching, an old Centre College fellow student. It was a campmeeting Presbytery. On Sabbath, on Oct. 21st, 1838, Junius B. King and I were ordained to the work of the ministry. King was then installed as pastor of the Valley Creek Church. I was ordained, as an Evangelist, to go to the "regions beyond," viz., to the Republic of Texas. Brother Mater preached the ordination sermon. Bro. Nall propounded the question and led in the ordination prayer. The occasion was to me especially solemn. . . .

October 22nd, 1838. What shadows we are! I returned to Texas by way of New Orleans, thence, in company with John Mc-

Cullough, we arrived in Houston, on Saturday, Nov. 4th, at 4 a. m. the day before the meeting of the Third Congress of the Lone Star Republic. Up to this time I was but a licentiate. Now I am a minister of the gospel.

Sabbath, Nov. 25th, 1838. Attended a meeting for the organization of a Texas Bible Society. The meeting was opened by Rev. Dr. Hoes, agent of the American Bible Society. Col. W. H. Wharton, Mr. Cullen, a member of Congress, and myself made addresses on resolutions. Col. Wharton's address was a very scholarly address on the Bible and its circulation, although he was a decided sceptic as to its inspiration. He left his scepticism out of this speech. The Society was organized in the evening of that day.

Brethren Chase and Blair spent the night with me. They were on their way from Natchez to Washington. Brother Blair spent the remainder of his life in Texas.

Sabbath, Dec. 2nd. Called on Rev. Mr. Frazer [Frazier], who was Chaplain of the Senate; thought him dangerously ill; preached in the Senate Hall, Sabbath night. Rev. Frazier died at 6 a. m.; preached his funeral at 3 p. m. He was a Cumberland Presbyterian from Tennessee. At 4 o'clock called on Col. Wharton; found him near the gate of death, more emaciated than any living man I had ever seen; conversed with him about Christianity, and prayed with him. He was in a critical state of mind. His deistical foundations giving way, and he was looking round for a stronger safer support. He asked me to pray for light to his soul. He had been a ring leader of scoffers.⁴ His right arm had been shattered in a duel. I learned afterwards that he had had a pious mother. Perhaps her piety had been remembered in the hour of his crisis, when he asked me to pray for light. Some of his deistical friends, I learned afterwards, were scandalized at his change of views, and said the preachers got about him in his last hours and terrified him in his weakness. My visiting him was at his own request, before I had any acquaintance with him. He had been one of the heroes of the war for Texas Independence.

Tuesday, Oct. 1st, 1839. Got off at 1:30 for Austin, the new Capital, on a small Mexican mare, for which I had given \$100.00, Texas money. I soon began to regret my trade for such a beast.

⁴The remainder of this paragraph seems to have been added later.

Rode to Dr. H's., twenty-four miles, rather poor fare, dirty beds, but paid enough, \$3.75.

Wednesday, Oct. 2nd. Rode to San Felipe de Austin, twenty-seven miles. Stopped at Kingsburry's, wretched fare, great noise in a billiard room adjoining, slept but little, but no charge.

Thursday, Oct. 3rd. Went to Dottery's, twenty-five miles. But little timber, rolling prairie. Some very agreeable prospects. Some Dutch settlers. Good fare for \$3.00. Met with Backus, from Montgomery, Alabama.

Friday, Oct. 4th. Rode to Ruttersville with Backus. Stopped at Reid's. Walked to campmeeting. Heard Bro. Sullivan preach.

Saturday, Oct. 5th. Rained while Dr. Hanie was preaching. An uncomfortable day. I preached at 3 p. m. from Is. 53:5. Snead preached at night.

Sabbath, Oct. 6th. Communion at 3 p. m. at campmeeting. I went to La Grange, and preached at night at the house of Mr. Fitzgerald, from Is. 41:21. A good congregation. Loughridge and Dr. Barnet with me.

Monday, Oct. 7th. Returned to campmeeting. Bro. Hill hold-
ing forth at 11 a. m. At 3 p. m. made a missionary address, Clark also, a good result. I preached at night from Phil. 1:27. Great excitement afterwards but little seriousness.

Tuesday, Oct. 8th. Campmeeting closed. Curious tactics of Dr. Hanie, for effect, at parting. Set off for Bastrop. Rain. Stopped at Hill's, twenty miles. Met with Judge Webb's family.

Wednesday, Oct. 9th. Got to Bastrop, twenty miles. River very high. Preached at Henderson's. Stayed at Brown's.

Thursday, Oct. 10th. Spent the day at Bastrop. Found several Presbyterians. Saw a coat with a small hole in the front, made by a poisoned Indian arrow, from which the wearer had died in great agony very soon.

Friday, Oct. 11th. Set off at 12 m. Got to Glascock's. Waters had been high but had abated. A lonesome road, had been recently infected by the Indians. Whithurst and I alone, neither of us armed. Slender fare for \$4.00. Passed a house where Mrs. Coleman and her son had been recently murdered by Indians.

Saturday, Oct. 12th, 1839. Arrived at Austin, 15 miles, at 12 m., safe and sound, but tired. A few men just setting off to bury the bones of thirteen men recently murdered by Indians, on

Brushy Creek, twenty miles from Austin. They soon returned, reporting that Indians had been within ten miles of the city, and had shot two men the day before. There was great excitement, but more talk than action. Guards were posted around the town. Slept very well at Bullock's the principal hotel, a large number of boarders, met a number of acquaintances.

Sabbath, Oct. 13th. Attended Sabbath School, at 10 a. m., twenty-two scholars. Preaching at 11. After preaching, organized the Presbyterian Church of Austin, consisting of six members. Brethren Bullock and Burke were chosen Elders. At 4 p. m. administered the communion of the Lord's Supper to eight persons; the first time that ordinance had ever been celebrated so far southwest, by Protestants, in North America. But few spectators present; could not have preaching at night, owing to the excitement about the Indians. General Burleson arrived about dark, with seventy men, to go after the Indians. May the Head of the Church make this small germ then and there planted a great tree, whose branches shall overshadow the nation. O Lord, behold and see and visit this vine and make it to flourish. Slept on the floor in Bullock's large room with General Burleson's army.

Austin had been located in June. Now there were some seven hundred people there, in cabins and shanties and tents. The government offices were in log cabins, on the main Ave., fronting the river. "Beautiful for situation" is Austin, with its seven hills.

Monday, Oct. 14th. Spent the day visiting friends and making acquaintances. Supped on Buffalo meat, and hot coffee in a tin cup, with Bro. Woodruff, in his camp. The Bullock Hotel was a curious structure. A substantial frame first story, on this two log rooms on either end, with a commodious room between, all enclosed. (After nineteen years I was there again. It was then Smith's Hotel, the same frame and log rooms.)

NEW LIGHT ON MANUEL LISA AND THE SPANISH FUR TRADE

HERBERT E. BOLTON

Below is printed what is believed to be a hitherto unpublished letter by Manuel Lisa, the best known of the early nineteenth century fur traders of St. Louis. It was written at Fuerte Manuel (Fort Manuel), on the Missouri, on September 8, 1812, evidently during the expedition begun by Lisa at St. Louis in May of that year.¹ It made its way to Chihuahua, where it was filed in the archives with a group of papers "concerning the introduction into the Province of New Mexico of four Frenchmen proceeding from Upper Louisiana," 1812-1813.² Just how it reached Chihuahua and by whose hands, the present writer has not ascertained, though it is possible that this could be learned from the documents with which it is preserved. Besides its merely curious interest as an additional autograph letter of the unique individual who wrote it, it is of importance on several counts.

In the first place, it throws new light on Lisa's fur trading operations during the years 1811 and 1812. It shows on the one hand that at this time his activities extended on a considerable scale to the Arapaho tribe, for we are told that he had sent to these people twenty-three men. It shows, also, that in 1812 he took steps to found a training post at the mouth of the Little Big Horn, sending Sanguinet with ten men for this purpose. It establishes, finally, an attempt by Lisa in 1812 to open commerce with the Spaniards of New Mexico, an enterprise he is believed to have once essayed³ at an earlier date.

Of more striking interest and importance is the light which the document throws upon Spanish activities on the northern frontier at this time. It is well known that the Spaniards of New Mexico

¹Chittenden, H. M. *The American Fur Trade of the Far West*, I, 126-127.

²The four Frenchmen were clearly not the ones mentioned in the letter, for the declaration of the four was taken in Santa Fé on July 30, 1812, before the letter here published was written. The four Frenchmen stated that they had left Louisiana because of dislike for American rule. They were sent to Chihuahua, and thence to Arispe, as prisoners, where they were still remaining in 1815.

³Coues, *Pike*, II, 574.

and Texas had not, before the taking possession of Louisiana by Spain, engaged extensively in the fur trade, though expeditions of which we have no notice may have been made, and a fair was more or less regularly held at Taos, to which the Indians of the plains took peltry to exchange for goods. But with the Louisiana cession, the fur trading system of the French was taken over by the Spanish government, and developed as the chief interest of the colony, the principal centers for its direction being St. Louis, Natchitoches, New Orleans, and the Arkansas Post. How much fur trading was done during this period from New Mexico as a base has not appeared, but we know that after 1780 considerable energy was spent in the establishment of communication between the new province of Louisiana and the older possession of New Mexico. We know, also, that after the purchase of Louisiana by the United States in 1803 the Spanish government made strenuous efforts to retain dominion over the Indians between New Mexico and the Missouri River by sending to them military and diplomatic expeditions in an endeavor to induce them to keep out the American traders and to turn their fur trade toward Santa Fé. In the interest of this policy were sent out the expeditions of Vial, Lucero, and Melgares, in the years 1804-1806.⁴ Now, from the present document, we learn that in 1812 the Spaniards had been going "every year to trade with the Arapahos," as far to the northeast as northern Colorado, and perhaps into Wyoming. Whether this enterprise was a new development, and part of the policy of resistance to American advance just adverted to, or the continuation of an established practice, we cannot at present say for certain, though the former seems to have been the case, judging from the evidence available.

The question arises naturally as to just where the Arapaho referred to were at this time. In general it is held by scholars that the Arapaho were divided into two branches, one inhabiting the North Platte in Wyoming, and the other the South Platte, in northern Colorado.⁵ Chittenden, in his work on the western fur trade, maintains that "no such distinction was known to the traders and trappers, and no Indians of this name are ever spoken of as dwelling in the northern mountains. When the Arapahos are mentioned the tribe in the valley of the South Platte is always

⁴Cox, I. J., *The Exploration of Louisiana*, 65-74.

⁵Mooney, in Hodge, *Handbook of American Indians*, I, 72.

meant.”⁶ Thwaites, on the other hand, referring to precisely the same period, states that “the Arapaho occupied the central mountainous region, roaming through Wyoming and southern Idaho.”⁷

It has already been remarked⁸ that Lisa never acquired a ready use of either English or French. The present letter enables us to add Spanish to the list of tongues of which he was not complete master.

(TRANSLATION.)

Fort Manuel, Sept. 8, 1812.

To the Spaniards of New Mexico.

My Dear Sirs: Ever since my first journey among the forks⁹ of the Missouri, nine hundred leagues from my domicile, I have desired to find an opportunity to communicate with my [com]patriots, the Spaniards. I have had hunters to the number of twenty-three who have gone to the Arapaho nation. Last year they came to my Fort Mandanne, where I equipped them anew to return to the place whence they had come. They are the ones who informed me that the Spaniards of Mexico were coming every year to trade with the Arapahos. Therefore I gave to a certain Juan Bautista Champlin,¹⁰ an honorable young man,¹¹ and Juan Bautista Lafargue, some goods for the purpose of trading with you, admonishing them that it must not be to the prejudice of the government, nor contrary to its laws.

Since some of my hunters should come this year to meet me at this establishment on the Missouri, and since up to the present I have not had any news [of them], I have decided to send one of

⁶*History of the American Fur Trade*, II, 878.

⁷*Early Western Travels*, V, 225, note 120.

⁸Chittenden, I, 135.

⁹*Balzo* is a nautical term meaning “bend.” Lisa seems to use the word *balzos* for *balsos*, which is a term applied to a bifurcated rope, used for raising weights. “Forks” is given as Lisa’s probable meaning.

¹⁰Houck (*History of Missouri*, II, 96) lists Baptiste Champlain as one of the early settlers of the Cuivre settlement, on Buffalo River, which drains the western part of Lincoln County, Missouri.

¹¹*Mozo*, in the old sense, meant “strong young man,” but the more usual modern meaning is “servant.” As used here the former meaning seems to be intended.

my trusted servants, Don Carlos Sanguinet,¹² with two *engages*¹³ to let them know where they should come out with their peltry; and for the same purpose, with the same Sanguinet, I sent ten men to the Petite Corne,¹⁴ which empties into the Rio Amarillo,¹⁵ and this into the Missouri, the entry of the Petite Corne being two hundred and twenty-five leagues from this establishment, with orders to establish [a post at] that place, as nearer for my hunters.

I have especially instructed Don Carlos Sanguinet to arrange that this letter of mine should fall into the hands of some Spaniard who may be worthy¹⁶ to communicate with me on those honorable principles, and in no other manner, my desire being to engage in business and open up a new commerce, which might easily be done. With this in view, and as director of the Missouri Fur Company, I propose to you gentlemen that if you wish to trade and deal with me, for whatever quantity of goods it may be, I will obligate myself to fill each year any bill of goods which shall be given me, and all shall be delivered [as stipulated] both as to quality and as to quantity, at the place nearest and most convenient for both parties, to your satisfaction, after we shall have agreed on the chosen place.

In case any of you should wish to come with Don Carlos Sanguinet to this my establishment to communicate and trade with me, you will be received and treated with great pleasure and satisfaction, and assured of a sufficient escort, agreeable to you, up to the time you return to your country. I commend Don Carlos Sanguinet to you as a trustworthy and honorable man, and, if you are agreed, you may confide in him without any fear whatever; and in case you do not come in person, I shall be obliged to you if you will write to me. Meanwhile, awaiting you, I beg God to spare you many years.

Your most attentive and faithful servant,

MANUEL LISA (Rubric).

Triplicate.

¹²For notes on Sanguinet, see Houck, *The Spanish Régime in Missouri*, and *The History of Missouri*, indexes.

¹³It is one of the shortcomings of our language that it is often necessary to translate a term from one foreign tongue in terms of another foreign tongue. This is an instance.

¹⁴Obviously the Little Big Horn.

¹⁵The Yellowstone River.

¹⁶Possibly he means "who may deign" to communicate with him.

(SPANISH TEXT OF THE LETTER.)

Fuerte Manuel 8 de 7bre. de 1812.

A los Españoles del Nuevo Mexico,

Muy Señores mios. Desde mi primer viage en los balzos del Mis-soury, nuevecientas leguas de mi Domicilio, deseaba el hallar oportu-nidad, para Comunicar con mis [com]Patriotes los Españoles, he tenido Caza[d]ores en Nombre de veinte y tres que fueron á la Nacion Arapaos. El Año pasado vinieron á mi Fuerte Mandanne, de donde los Reequipe de nuevo, para volverse de donde havian Salido; ellos fueron que me han Ynstruido que los Mexicanos Españoles benian todos los Años Tratar con los Arapaos. Entonces di á un Tal Juan Bte. Champlin, mozo Honrado, y á Juan Bte. Lafargue, álgunos Efectos en Mercancias, para Tratar con vms, con la Recomendacion, que no fuera en perjuicio del Govierno, y con-trario á sus Leyes.

Como álgunos de mis Cazaores devian de venir este Año, el hallarse con migo sobre el Missouri, á este Establecimto., y ásta Esta Epoca no teniendo novedad, me determiné el expedir uno de mis Mozos de Confianza Dn. Carlos Sanguinet, con dos Enganchados, á fin de hazerles Saber donde, y en que parage deven de Salir con sus peleterias, y á este mismo Efecto, con el mismo Sanguinet Exdy diez hombres á la (petite Corne) que caé en el Río Amarillo, y este en el Missouri á 225 Leguas la Entrada de la (Petite Corne) á este Establecimto. con orden de Establecer ésse Lugar como mas proximo para mis Cazaores.

He Recomendado con particular á Dn. Carlos Sanguinet de hazer modo que esta mi carta llegue en manos de álgun Español que sea digno de comunicar con migo, en áquellos principios de honradez, y no de ótra manera, mis deseos siendo el de hazer negocios, y havrir un nuevo comercio, que con facilidad se puede hazer, á este Efecto propongo á vmds. como Director de la Compañia de los Pielles del Missouri, si quieren Tratar, y contractar con migo, per qualquiera cantidad que sea en Mercancias, yo me obligaré cada Año, el llenar el Estado que se me dará, y el todo será librado, Tanto por la calidad, como por la cantidad ál Lugar mas proximo, y mas aventajoso, por las dos partes, á su Satisfaccion, despues que havremos Caído de ácuerso del Lugar Escogido.

En caso que álguno de vmds. quisiera el venir con Dn. Carlos Sanguinet á Este mi Establecimto., el comunicar y Tratar con

migo sera con mho Gusto, y satisfaccion que será recevido y Tratado, Asegurandole Escorta suficiente, y á su satisfaccion hasta que buelva á su Patria. Recomiendo á vmds Dn. Carlos Sanguinet, como hombre de confianza y Honrado, y si se encuentran juntos, pueden el havrirse con el sin Temor alguno, estimaré a vmds el Escribirme, en caso que no vengán en persona, ynterin esperando por vms, quedo Rogando á Dios le Gue su vida mhos años.

Su mas Atento y Seguro Servidor

MANUEL LISA (Rubric).

Triplicada.

CORRESPONDENCE FROM THE BRITISH ARCHIVES
CONCERNING TEXAS, 1837-1846

VII

EDITED BY EPHRAIM DOUGLASS ADAMS

DOYLE TO ELLIOT¹

[Enclosure.]

Mexico, 27 May. 1843.

Copy.

Charles Elliot.

Sir,

I have the honor to inform you that at an interview which took place with His Excellency the President General Santa Aña on the 24th Instant, He spoke to me a good deal about the present position of this Country with Texas, and added that He was ready to treat upon the terms proposed by him and forwarded through Mr Robinson, with which you are acquainted. I pressed him as much as possible with respect to the fallacy of the plan with respect to the Sovereignty of Mexico being acknowledged by Texas; but at present He does not seem at all inclined to give way on that point.

*I further stated to him how useless I felt it would be to send Commissioners to treat on any terms so long as the present warfare was carried on; and His Excellency has Authorized me to acquaint you for the information of General Houston, that He will agree to an Armistice, and He told me he would at once give orders for a total cessation of hostilities on his part, and requested that General Houston would send similar orders to the different Officers Commanding the Texian forces; and that in such case He was ready to receive any Commissioners which might be sent from Texas to treat on the terms proposed by him*²

I am of the same opinion with yourself respecting the total fallacy and impolicy of that part of the plan of the President Santa Aña claiming an empty Sovereignty over Texas, but as I

¹F. O., Texas, Vol. 6.

²This paragraph only is printed in Garrison, *Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas*, III, 1091; in *Am. Hist. Assoc. Report*, 1908, II. "The portion of this Despatch contained within the crosses [asterisks], is the portion which has been communicated to the Government of Texas.—CHARLES ELLIOT."

collected from your Correspondence how important you felt it to be that an armistice should be granted, and even intimated that a large party in Texas with a view of doing what they thought best for them at the present moment might accept General Santa Aña's proposition, I felt it my duty to accept the offer He made and acquainted him that I would write to you on this Matter without loss of time.

I have by the last packet informed Lord Aberdeen of what has taken place.

Percy Doyle.

To Captain Charles Elliot, R. N.

[Endorsed]. Inclosure No 1 in Capt. Elliot's despatch No. 12. to the Earl of Aberdeen. Galveston June 10th 1843.

ELLIOT TO ABERDEEN³

No. 13.

Galveston June 21st 1843.

My Lord,

Thinking it possible that Her Majesty's Sloop "Scylla" may catch the Mail of the 29th at Vera Cruz, I have the honor to forward by her the accompanying Copy of the Proclamation of Armistice issued by this Government.⁴

But as it seems probable that my Communication through the United States will reach England before the Mail from Mexico I shall transmit the Correspondence connected with this Affair through the usual channel.

Charles Elliot

To The Earl of Aberdeen, K. T.

Downing Street

ELLIOT TO ABERDEEN⁵

No. 15.⁶

Galveston, June 22nd 1843.

My Lord,

Having reference to my dispatch No. 12 of the 10th Instant I have now the honor to transmit to Your Lordship the reply of the

³F. O., Texas, Vol. 6.

⁴A proclamation suspending hostilities with Mexico, June 15, 1843. Printed in *Niles' Register*, LXIV, 307.

⁵F. O., Texas, Vol. 6.

⁶No. 14, Elliot to Aberdeen, on the whereabouts of Mr. John Orr, has been omitted.

Secretary of State of this Republic to my Note to him,⁷ a Copy of which was forwarded in the despatch No. 12.

I beg also to transmit a Copy of the Proclamation of the Armistice issued by the President of Texas, and a Copy of the despatch I addressed to Mr. Doyle in reply to his of the 27th Ultimo, a Copy of which has already been forwarded to Your Lordship in my despatch No 12.

I also avail myself of this occasion to acknowledge Your Lordship's despatch No. 5 of the 10th Ultimo,⁸ and to transmit a Copy of the note I have thereupon addressed to Mr. Jones.⁹

Charles Elliot.

To The Earl of Aberdeen, K. T.
Downing Street

ELLIOT TO DOYLE¹⁰

[Enclosure].

Galveston June 21st 1843.

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge Your despatch of the 27th Ultimo by Her Majesty's Sloop "Scylla" (received here upon the night of the 9 Instant) and in reply I beg leave to transmit to you.

1st. Copy of a Note from myself to the Secretary of State of this Republic, dated on the 10th Instant.¹¹

2d. Copy of the reply of the Secretary of State to my Note of the 10th Instant, dated 15th Instant.¹²

3d. An authentic Copy of a Proclamation of Armistice by the President of Texas, dated 15 Instant.¹³

I trust that it will be in your power to induce the President of Mexico to accede to the arrangement made by this Government respecting the duration of the Armistice pending the Negotiations for peace, and till due notice of a determination to renew hostili-

⁷Jones to Elliott, June 15, 1843. In Garrison, *Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas*, III, 1092-1093; in *Am. Hist. Assoc. Report*, 1908, II.

⁸The correct date for Aberdeen's No. 5 is May 18, 1843.

⁹Elliott to Jones, June 18, 1843. In Garrison, *Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas*, III, 1096-1097; in *Am. Hist. Assoc. Report*, 1908, II.

¹⁰F. O., Texas, Vol. 6.

¹¹Elliott to Jones, June 10, 1843. In Garrison, *Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas*, III, 1090; in *Am. Hist. Assoc. Report*, 1908, II.

¹²See Note 7 above.

¹³See Note 4, page 68.

ties upon the part of either Government should be given to the other through Her Majesty's Representatives in Mexico and Texas. It is satisfactory to me to find that your opinions are concurrent with my own upon the fallacy and impolicy of that part of General Santa Aña's plan claiming an empty Sovereignty over Texas, and thinking it possible that your dates from England may not be so recent as my own, and that it may be convenient to you at this Con-juncture to know the impressions of Her Majesty's Government upon the propositions sent on to this Country by Mr Robinson, I have herewith the honor to transmit to you the Copy of a despatch from Lord Aberdeen, received three days since, dated upon the 18th Ultimo.¹⁴

I would remark, here, that there has been some misconception as to any opinion upon my part that a large party in Texas with a view of doing what they thought best for them at the present moment, might accept General Santa Aña's proposition. I remarked indeed in a private communication to Mr Packenham that it would not surprise me to find the project temporarily favored, and I have heard that was the Case to a limited extent, and for a brief space of time, but it was not my belief that it would be countenanced for a moment by the Government of the Republic, or indeed steadily, by any considerable part of the people. My observations upon that part of the subject were intended generally to sustain my own impression that a cessation of hostilities was very desirable on every ground of consideration, and particularly till you could learn the views of Her Majesty's Government after these overtures should become known in that quarter.

It is to be hoped that the wise and becoming conduct of this Government in refusing to take part in the struggle in Yucatan and respecting the late unauthorised movement of the two Texian Vessels of War to that Coast from New Orleans, will facilitate an early and honorable close of this Contest.

In the state of understanding between Her Majesty's Government and that of The King of the French concerning the settlement of these differences I considered it suitable to communicate the subject of Your despatch to my Colleague Monsieur de Cramayel before I addressed this Government in relation to it, and He

¹⁴See Aberdeen to Elliot, No. 5, May 18, 1843. *THE QUARTERLY*, XVI, 307.

concurred with me that every proper effort should be made to dispose the President to agree to the Armistice.

Charles Elliot.

Percy W. Doyle

H. M. Chargé d' Affaires, Mexico.

Copy.

Charles Elliot.

[Endorsed]. Inclosure No 3 in Captain Elliot's despatch No 15 to the Earl of Aberdeen. Galveston June 22d. 1843.

ELLIOT TO ABERDEEN¹⁵

No. 17.¹⁶

Galveston June 24th 1843.

My Lord,

I have the honor to forward Your Lordship some extracts from a private letter which I sent to Mr Doyle, with the reply to his despatch of the 27th Ultimo. The other parts of this letter need not be intruded upon Your Lordship; They referred to a request General Thompson had made to Mr. Doyle to see a private communication I had addressed to Mr. Packenham by the request of General Houston, upon the subject of the Prisoners taken at Mier, which Communication Mr Doyle had of course declined to shew to General Thompson.

I have also thought it convenient to forward with these despatches two Newspapers for Your Lordship's examination, the first (The "National Vindicator"¹⁷ which is the Government organ) containing the President's Instructions to the Commissioners sent on to New Orleans for the purpose of enforcing the orders upon Commodore Moore to return to this Port; and the Second (the "Civilian"¹⁸ by far the best conducted Journal and of most influence in the Country) containing some observations on the Armistice, deserving of attention.

Charles Elliot

To The Earl of Aberdeen, K. T.

Downing Street.

¹⁵F. O., Texas, Vol. 6.

¹⁶No. 16, Elliot to Aberdeen, reporting that he has received from Texas £3 15s 9d for supplies furnished the schooner *San Bernard*, has been omitted.

¹⁷Issue of June 3, 1843.

¹⁸The *Civilian and Galveston City Gazette*, June 24, 1843.

ELLIOT TO DOYLE¹⁹

Extracts from a private letter from Captain Elliot to Percy W. Doyle, Esqr. Mexico. dated at Galveston June 21st 1843.

No. 1. "My despatch will make you acquainted with General Houston's acceptance of the Armistice, and I hope you will have no difficulty in inducing General Santa Aña to accede to the usual and reasonable arrangements General Houston has made respecting the duration of the Armistice. I do sincerely hope that these advances, on all sides, may be improved into a speedy and honorable pacification, and however great the relief to this Country will be, it seems manifest to me that it will be of higher permanent advantage to Mexico. For I firmly believe that it is in General Santa Aña's power, by speedy, wise, and liberal arrangements with Texas, upon the basis of it's independence, pretty rapidly to detach it from it's intimate connexion with the people and things East of the Sabine, to the great increase and security of the just and powerful influence of his own Country on this Continent. With a comprehensive policy on his part, steadily directed to these ends, Texas would settle to a considerable extent by emigration from England, Germany and France; And a people will be placed between the United States and Mexico, whose interest it will be not merely to maintain a Neutral attitude, in the event of dispute with that Country (which would draw a large portion of the foreign trade with Mexico into the ports of Texas) but rather to lean to the side of Mexico. For independent Texas will be in many respects a rival producing Country with the United States, and will soon come to feel that it is more likely the United States should stretch Westward over Texas, than that Mexico should stretch Eastward over Texas. I should tell you that there is no reason whatever to believe that the present Government of Texas has any undue feelings of partiality towards the United States. There is no bias that way, and the late honorable conduct of President Houston concerning the movements of the Texian Squadron to the Coast of Yucatan may also serve to help out a happy conclusion of this Contest; the continuance of which is filling this Country with desperadoes from every part of the South, eager to penetrate into Mexico and bidding

¹⁹F. O., Texas, Vol. 6.

fair to turn the Gulf of Mexico into a piratical cruizing ground. General Santa Aña is preventing the settlement of this Country by people disposed to be peaceful and orderly, and filling it pretty fast with a class of persons, the fellows of whom I do not believe are to be found on the face of the Globe. The sounder policy will be to make a very liberal peace with Texas, and to strengthen the hands of this Government by every kind of friendly Countenance. Such a course would roll back a tide of mischief East of the Sabine, and a contrary will as surely induce a high flood West of it."

"Speaking of the late movement upon Yucatan by the Ships, I cannot refrain from observing, that it was much more a United States, or at all events a New Orleans expedition, than a Texian. This Government was conscientiously, and extremely averse to it, did all that it could to prevent it, and all that it could to put an end to it, regardless of shameful abuse both in the United States and here, and much worse, be it observed, in the United States, than here. The Expedition sailed from New Orleans, was mainly assisted by Citizens of this place, and has I believe been recently reinforced by Volunteers raised in that City; and all this though it was notorious that Commodore Moore was acting in total disobedience of the orders of his Government. If the Government of the United States, could have prevented these things they surely ought to have done so, and if they could not, their powerlessness is very dangerous to their Neighbours, and deplorable for themselves."

2d. "The plain fact is that General Houston is very unpopular in the United States and here, because of his moderate policy with regard to Mexico, and particularly since his determined opposition to these purposes of interference in the Affairs of Yucatan."

"These feelings of ill will to him are aggravated by the impression that his wise and moderate conduct is agreeable to Her Majesty's Government, and well calculated to strengthen their efforts for a speedy and peaceful Settlement of this Contest. This is the true cause of all the bitterness towards him in the United States, and I happen to know that General Thompson has very particular friends in that Country, most particularly hostile to General Houston. Putting all these things together you will not wonder that I should earnestly beg that there may be no relaxation of your just reserve respecting the exhibition of my private letters to General Thompson."

3d. "The American Government and it's functionaries need careful handling in this Texian matter. Be assured that the adjustment of this question on the basis of the independence of Texas, is ill liked in the United States, particularly through the help of our own and other European Governments. These good folks desire to keep it an open question, as well for the chances of the future incorporation of Texas with the Union, as because it serves as a sort of *raw* upon Mexico, whenever there is any hesitation about American demands upon that Country. This reflection leads me to think that it will be very advantageous if you can persuade the Mexican Government to adopt the principle of General Houston's arrangement with respect to the duration of the Armistice. If the duration of the Armistice depended in any way upon the good offices of American Officers near either Government, it is to be apprehended that it might not last long enough for any permanent useful purpose"

Copy. Charles Elliot.

[Endorsed] Inclosure in Captain Elliot's despatch to the Earl of Aberdeen No 17. Galveston June 24. 1843.

ELLIOT TO ABERDEEN²¹

No. 18.

Galveston July 4th. 1843.

My Lord,

I have the honor to transmit a note from Mr. Jones,²² in reply to the note I addressed to him upon the 18th Ultimo communicating assurances of the continued interest felt by Her Majesty's Government in the prosperity and independence of Texas, and of the full determination to persevere in efforts for the peaceful adjustment of the difficulties between this Country and Mexico, whenever a hope of success should present itself.

With this communication I have also received private letters from General Houston, and Mr. Jones expressive of an earnest desire for the appointment of a British Consular Agent at Corpus Christi. General Houston thinks that "the effect would be very

²¹F. O., Texas, Vol. 6.

²²Jones to Elliot, June 28, 1843. In Garrison, *Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas*, III, 1097, in *Am. Hist. Assoc. Report*, 1908, II.

beneficial upon the dispositions of the Mexicans as well as the Texians, and even upon the Indians, who have recently depredated upon the poor families at that point. The Irish families who have claimed to be British Subjects will derive confidence, and resume their former habitations, and pursue the arts of peace with delight and Advantage. I doubt not, but what the United States will support a Consul at Corpus Christi." Mr. Jones thinks that a flourishing trade will soon grow up in that quarter with the neighbouring Mexican Settlements, and looks to the increase and security of Commercial intercourse, as the surest means of establishing the steady pacification of the frontier.

I shall inform the President and Mr. Jones that my Instructions prevent me from making the desired appointment without Your Lordship's sanction, but that I am persuaded the President's wishes will always have great weight with Her Majesty's Government.

Aransas Inlet, and Corpus Christi Bay, are situated at the Mouth of the river "Nueces," and formed the Western limit of Texas, proper, according to the Spanish and Mexican divisions of the Country. It's contiguity to the San Patricio Settlements, alluded to by the President, will probably recommend this suggestion to your Lordship's consideration

Charles Elliot.

To The Earl of Aberdeen, K. T.

Downing Street

ELLIOT TO ABERDEEN²³

No. 19.

Galveston July 15th 1843.

My Lord,

The Inclosures form a Correspondence, which I have recently had with a Gentleman of the name of Yates, a Citizen of this Republic, resident in this place. It arose from a letter He had addressed to a Mr. S. Converse in London dated on the 19th March last (of which I heard for the first time two day's since) recently published at Boston, and republished at New Orlen^{as}.²⁴

²³F. O., Texas, Vol. 6.

²⁴Yates' letter to Converse, widely printed in American newspapers, created the impression that he was writing with Elliot's authority, and that Great Britain was actively interested in procuring abolition in Texas. Smith, *Annexation of Texas*, 113.

The impressions that the abolition of Slavery in this Republic, would be agreeable in England, and that it would be practicable to raise a loan there on the Security of the lands in Texas, in furtherance of that object, are probably entertained by many persons in this Country. But whether such views be well founded or not, it is the fact that Mr. Yates has been conveying to Mr. Converse his own inferences and impressions in these particulars, and not what I said to him; and Your Lordship will observe that He has ascribed the different turn of his letter to Mr. Converse, to the haste of that Communication; which would no doubt have been avoided if He had supposed it would find its way before the public.

It is the case as Mr. Yates observes that I was on board the Steam Boat on the passage from Houston with my Colleague Monsieur de Cramayel, on the occasion to which He alludes, though I did not hear the address of which He speaks. But I did not consider that the excitement prevailing here at that time was otherwise than temporary; and I do not perceive that it formed part of my duty to report every casual ebullition of popular Sentiment, on Subjects of internal interest, in my despatches to Her Majesty's Government. I have conversed with my Colleague since upon the subject, more than once, and I believe his opinions were coincident with my own, as to the temporary character of the excitement manifested on that occasion; and perhaps, it may not be amiss to add that we both of us ventured to suggest to the Gentleman who was coming to Galveston to test the state of public feeling here, that He might expose himself to some degree of danger, by the abrupt introduction of such a Subject, on the people of this Town.

That the opinions of Mr. Yates and those who think like him, are founded upon sound conceptions of what would most conduce to the strength and durable prosperity of this Republic, is certainly my belief. But I have never given any warrant for the use of my name on such subjects, and certainly never said what has been imputed to me.

Charles Elliot

The Earl of Aberdeen, K. T.
Downing Street

YATES TO ELLIOT²⁵

[Enclosure.] Copy. Charles Elliot. Galveston July 12th. 1843.

To Captain Charles Elliot.

Sir—

I was much surprised to receive by the Steamer which arrived this Morning a Copy of the "New Orleans Republican" of July 3d containing a letter purporting to have been written by me to S. Converse, Esqre. of London, which was preceded by a letter from a London Correspondent of the Boston Post, and some editorial remarks reflecting on yourself, and the Government you have the honor to represent in a most unwarrantable manner, and in which my letter was referred to as Authority for the correctness of those remarks.

Without reflecting on the impropriety of my Correspondent in publishing that letter, I feel it a matter of duty to place in your hands without delay, and as far as in my power a full exculpation from the charges thus made or insinuated.

In my letter to Mr. Converse under date of 19th March last, speaking on the subject of emancipating the Negroes of Texas, the following expression occurs "I had also held several conversations with the British Minister here, and from him I learned that such a Measure would secure for us the warmest support from the British Government, in our present Struggle, and also the means of paying for our Slaves, by their Citizens giving lands in exchange"

The Writer of the London letter under date of June 2d, says "I enclose the Copy of a letter received here by the last Steamer from Galveston, in which you will see that the British Minister in Texas has been endeavouring to persuade the people of that Republic, that if they will alter their constitution so as to abolish Slavery, then this government will aid them in their Struggle with Mexico, and furnish the Money to pay for their Slaves, the Texians giving lands, &c, &c".

My letter to Mr. Converse was written in much haste after the arrival of the Houston Boat referred to, in it, which occurred at a very late hour on Saturday Night, and the Steamer sailed for New Orleans on the Morning of the following day. Mr. S. P.

²⁵F. O., Texas, Vol. 6.

Andrews of Houston and some others came passengers in the Houston Boat, with the avowed intention of ascertaining the feelings of the Citizens of Galveston on the Subject, *not of abolition*, but of gradual emancipation of Slaves, and on the representations of himself and his Associate I was induced to write in the strong and encouraging terms used in that letter. With respect to yourself and the efforts you have made to persuade the people of Texas, to entertain such a project it is due from me to you to say that as far as my knowledge and your communication to me extends, you have stated distinctly that you were instructed by your Government to interfere in no manner with the internal institutions and regulations of this Government; and that *in answer to my enquiries*, you stated your private opinion as an individual, that such a measure (which I intimated as probable) would be gratifying to the British Nation, and secure for this her ardent support, and that there were parties in England who felt so deeply interested on the subject, that you believed such might be found who would advance the Capital necessary to purchase our Negroes, for the purpose of manumission, and that they would receive our lands in exchange on the assurance of a prohibition to the further importation of Slaves.

As you were a passenger on board the Houston Boat at the time I have mentioned, and witnessed the state of feeling which then existed amongst the passengers on that trip, and must have heard the address made to them by a distinguished Citizen, on their way down warmly advocating the Measure I presumed you would advise Your Government of the state of feeling which you then saw evinced, and therefore stated in my letter to Mr. S. Converse that I had reason to believe you had communicated on the Subject. You never have stated to me those communications, or any part of them; and I did not see you after your arrival from Houston, previous to the departure of the packet, for New Orleans, the suggestion on this point was therefore only conjecture on my part.

As to the intervention of Your Government in our Affairs with Mexico, emanating from a desire to promote the abolition of Slavery here, and it's being exerted as a consideration for such a Measure, the statement is too publicly destitute of foundation to need a refutation. Those who know anything of the foreign relations of this Government are aware of the fact that the inter-

vention of the Government of Great Britain has been pledged to us by treaty stipulation, near three years since, and without the most remote reference to this Subject, and that it has since been most efficiently exerted in our behalf.

The London Correspondent and the New Orleans Editor have alluded to the true cause of the difficulty. They evidently care but little for Texas "her weal or woe" but are willing to sacrifice her prosperity and welfare to the protection of the Slave property held in the States on her frontier. This country has been in a great measure governed and controlled by this influence, and it was to avoid it that I stated in my letter that the emancipation must be incidentally laid before a Convention of the people, in order to ensure success, and not because of the opposition I feared it would meet with at home.

There is no reason for the alarm these writers have expressed because if Texas should entertain the project, She will afford the Slave holders of the Union a better protection for their Slave property, by treaty, than they now have from their Sister States.

Sir, I am no *abolitionist*, nor am I, nor have I ever been, nor can I be in correspondence with any, for the purpose of promoting their views, but I do believe that free labor is ten fold more productive of prosperity in this, or any enlightened country, than Slave labour, and it is for this reason I desire to see the introduction to this Country of free White industrious families of the laboring Classes, well satisfied that they will eventually supersede the Slave; and gradually but surely remove the incubus that rests upon us. This change must be a voluntary and a gradual one, and I have uniformly advocated the doctrine that a Government composed as ours is can only prohibit the further introduction of Slaves, and having provided the means for the purchase of those already introduced, must leave it optional with the proprietor to sell or retain at pleasure, and I sincerely believe that such a provision being made, Texas would become a free State, by the unanimous will of the Citizens, in ten years thereafter.

In conclusion permit me to assure you that while I sincerely regret the occasion for this letter, I cannot but feel happy in the opportunity it affords me of bearing my humble testimony to the uniform expression of your desire for the prosperity of my Country, the firm conviction that your official as well as private inter-

course has contributed much to promote that object, and that in so doing I express the sentiments of a large Majority of my fellow Citizens.

A. J. Yates.

[Endorsed]. Inclosure No. 1 in Captain Elliot's Despatch No 19. to the Earl of Aberdeen. July 15. 1843.

ELLIOT TO YATES²⁶

Private

Galveston July 13th. 1843.

Sir.

I beg to acknowledge your letter of Yesterday's date founded upon a letter from you to Mr. S. Converse, recently published in Boston.

Whenever the subject matter of that communication has been mentioned to me in conversation, either by you, or any other Gentleman of my acquaintance in the Republic, I have invariably made the remark to which you advert, namely, that I was instructed to interfere in no manner with the internal institutions or regulations of this Government.

But either in doing that, or in denying the unfounded charge of undue interference, I have always guarded myself from being supposed to entertain different opinions upon the general subject, from those held by the great body of my Countrymen.

Sensible, however of the inconvenience of any misconception on such a point I have also always said to others what I said to you; that is, that what fell from me must be particularly understood to be no more than the expression of my own individual opinion, for I had neither knowledge of, nor authority to speak to, opinions or feelings in any other quarter I can readily understand [in] the hurry of your Communication to Mr. S. Converse you intended to convey your own impressions founded upon your conversation with me, and not my expressions. But at all events I entertain

²⁶F. O., Texas, Vol. 6.

no doubt that you will take some suitable means of preventing further misconception, so far as I am concerned.

Copy. Charles Elliot.

Charles Elliot.

A. J. Yates, Esqre.

Galveston.

[Endorsed.] Inclosure No. 2 in Captain Elliot's Despatch No. 19, to the Earl of Aberdeen, July 15th 1843.

YATES TO ELLIOT²⁷

[Enclosure].

Private.

To Captain Charles Elliot.

Galveston.

Sir,

Your favor of the 13th Instant in reply to my letter of the letter [*Sic*] of 12th is before me.

That portion of my letter to Mr. Converse, under date 19th March last, which refers to conversations held with you on the subject therein alluded to was intended and can certainly be considered as nothing more than an expression of inferences drawn by me from your remarks, and in the excitement which then existed in this Community, I am free to acknowledge that those inferences were not warranted so much by your expressions, as by my own knowledge of the dispositions and feelings of your Countrymen on the Subject.

So far from understanding you to say that the British Government were disposed to interfere with the question of Slavery in this Country, I distinctly recollect your reiterated declaration that you had been positively instructed to avoid any interference with our Civil and domestic institutions.

I shall avail myself of the earliest opportunity to remove the misconstruction put upon my letter to Mr. Converse in relation to yourself, and the misconception of the part you have taken in the matter which seems to be entertained by some and founded on expressions contained in that letter.

Sincerely hoping that no inconvenience may result to yourself from the temporary prevalence of erroneous impressions, which

²⁷F. O., Texas, Vol. 6.

may be entertained by a few individuals in regard to the course you have pursued, and which can be so readily removed, I have the honor to be with Sentiments of the highest respect and consideration

A. J. Yates.

Galveston July 15. 1843.

Copy. Charles Elliot

[Endorsed.]. Inclosure No. 3 in Capn. Elliot's Despatch No. 19 to the Earl of Aberdeen. July 15th. 1843.

ELLIOT TO ABERDEEN²⁸

No. 20.

Galveston July 16th. 1843.

My Lord,

I have had the honor to receive Your Lordship's despatches Nos. 6 and 7.

This Government has not yet appointed Commissioners to proceed to Mexico; pausing, till it shall be ascertained whether General Santa Aña has adopted General Houston's arrangement with respect to the duration of the Armistice. It is much to be hoped that the Mexican Government will not insist upon the immediate and unqualified acknowledgment of the Sovereignty of Mexico, as an indispensable preliminary condition to the opening of negotiations, but content itself with an expression of general readiness upon the part of this Government maturely to consider any scheme of adjustment which may be proposed, upon the part of Mexico.

With a continued state of pacification, and the lapse of time, feelings of irritation will naturally subside; and both parties addressing themselves to the task in a spirit of temperate enquiry I should hope that there are no insuperable obstacles to the settlement of this dispute upon a durable and creditable footing, and certainly upon terms of advantage to Mexico which there is no ground to believe could be secured by a protraction of the Contest.

I avail myself of this occasion to announce the return of the Texian Ships of War "Austin" and "Wharton" to this port, from the Coast of Yucatan, reporting intelligence that the difficulties

²⁸F. O., Texas, Vol. 6.

in that quarter, are not yet adjusted. The Vessels arrived on the 14th. Instant.

Charles Elliot.

The Earl of Aberdeen, K. T.

ELLIOT TO ABERDEEN²⁹

No. 21.

Galveston July 29th. 1843.

My Lord.

With reference to my despatch No. 19, I have now to solicit Your Lordship's attention to a letter⁵⁰ addressed by Mr. Yates to the Editor of the same New Orleans print, in which his letter to Mr. Converse of the 19th. March last was recently Copied from a Boston paper.

Charles Elliot.

The Earl of Aberdeen, K. T.

ELLIOT TO ABERDEEN³¹

No. 22.

Galveston August 3rd. 1843.

My Lord,

Her Majesty's Sloop. "Scylla" returned to this anchorage on the 23rd Ultimo, bringing me despatches from Her Majesty's Chargé d' Affaires in Mexico dated on the 8th Idem, and I have now the honor to transmit to Your Lordship my subsequent correspondence with this Government,³² and that Gentleman.

I have also taken the liberty to forward some extracts from a private letter I have addressed to Mr. Doyle with these dispatches. I may mention that I do not forward copies of Mr. Doyle's communications to me,³³ because I learn from him that they have already been transmitted through the United States.

Trusting that the present attitude of these Affairs will be satisfactory to Her Majesty's Government, I have the honor to remain,

Charles Elliot.

²⁹F. O., Texas, Vol. 6.

³⁰Yates to the *New Orleans Republican*, July 17, 1843.

³¹F. O. Texas, Vol. 6.

³²Elliot to Jones, July 24, 1843. In Garrison, *Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas*, III, 1112-1113, in *Am. Hist. Assoc. Report*, 1908, II.

³³F. O., Mexico, 163. Doyle to Aberdeen, No. 51, July 30, 1843, enclosing copy of letter to Elliot of July 8, outlining Santa Anna's ideas as to an armistice.

Her Majesty's Sloop sailed to Vera Cruz, with my reply, last evening

Charles Elliot.

The Earl of Aberdeen. K. T.

ELLIOT TO DOYLE³⁴

[Enclosure.] Copy. Charles Elliot.

Galveston.

August 2nd. 1843.

Sir.

I have the honor to acknowledge your despatch of the 8th Ultimo. by H. M. S. "Scylla," and in reply beg leave to transmit to you,

1. Copy of a letter from myself to the Secretary of State of this Republic.³⁵
2. Copy of Mr. Jones's reply.³⁶
3. Copy of a despatch from the Secretary of War and Marine to General Wells.³⁷

I have also forwarded the Copy of a despatch which I have recently had the honor to receive from Lord Aberdeen dated on the 3rd Ultimo,³⁸ thinking it possible that you may not yet have received any despatches of so late a date at Mexico.

These moderate dispositions of the Government of Texas cannot fail to be satisfactory to the President of Mexico. But His Excellency will naturally have collected from public sources of information that General Houston is exposed to violent opposition in this Country on account of that Moderation, and it is much to be hoped that the Government of Mexico will have constant and

³⁴F. O., Texas, Vol. 6.

³⁵See note 32 above.

³⁶Jones to Elliot, July 30, 1843. In Garrison, *Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas*, III, 1114-1115, in Am. Hist. Assoc. Report, 1908, II.

³⁷Woll to Houston, July 16, 1843, and Hill to Woll, July 29, 1843 (copies of which were enclosed in this letter and are here printed), are noted by Garrison as "not found." (*Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas*, III, 1115, in Am. Hist. Assoc. Report, 1908, II.)

³⁸F. O., Texas, 19, Aberdeen to Elliot, No. 9. This was really a dispatch to Doyle (of which a copy was sent to Elliot) on Mexican threats with regard to foreigners in Texas. Elliot, therefore, sends a copy to Doyle, because mails to Texas were more regular than to Mexico.

very considerate regard to that state of things in the negotiations for the final adjustment of this painful and fruitless contest.

The release of the Texian prisoners in Mexico would have the effect of allaying angry feeling, and strengthening the influence of this Government for the attainment of its wise and moderate purposes: I believe too, that I cannot be saying too much in adding, that this step would be agreeable to Her Majesty's Government, and perhaps facilitate their dispositions to be helpful in the satisfactory settlement of this dispute.

In conclusion, I will take the liberty to express the hope and belief that General Santa Aña will fully avail himself of any becoming opportunity of reconciling his own personal and generous impulses toward these Prisoners, with the dictates of sound Policy, and a just consideration for the situation and wishes of this Government.

Charles Elliot.

Percy W Doyle Esquire.

Mexico

[Endorsed] Inclosure No 5 in Captain Elliot's Despatch to the Earl of Aberdeen. No. 22. August 3d, 1843.

WOLL TO HOUSTON³⁹

[Enclosure]

Cuerpo de ejército del Norte, General en gefe.

Matamoros Julio 16 de 1843

Sor Gral Dn Samuel Houston

Muy Señor mio, Conforme á las ordenes del Supremo Gobierno que me anuncia há proclamado V. un Armisticio en Tejas me apresaré á manifestar á V, que daré las convenientes para que se suspendan por las tropas de Ejército de mi Mando, las hostilidades contra Tejas Mandando retirar en todos los puntos de la linea las avansadas, descubiertos, y partidas de observacion que tenemos sobre dicha pais, tan luego como se sirva V. anunciarme, que ha prevenido a las fuerzas que componen la espedicion de Santa Fé retrocedan inmediatamente suspendiendo toda hostilidad contra la Republica Mejicana, en el caso que dicha espedicion estuviere autorizada por Tejas—ó que se sirva hacer una declaracion oficial y solemne de que aquellos invasores no pertenean á Tejas, para

³⁹F. O., Texas, Vol. 6.

que en este ultimo caso puedan ser batidos perseguidos por los tropas Mejicanas en atencion á que no estan y no puedan estar comprendidos en el armisticio que estoy facultado para celebrar con V. ni en la consiguiente suspencion de hostilidades.

Por lo tanto, desio que á la mayor brevedad posible se sirva V. Contestar, y si como es de creerse la espedicion de Santa Fé no ha sido autorisada por V. y de consiguiente hace V. a nombre de Tejas la declaracion oficial y solemne ya mencionada será conveniente nombre V. los Comisionados que en Union de los que eligere por parte del Supremo Gobierno se ocupan de celebrar un armisticio entre las partes beligerentes.

La villa de Laredo pudiera ser el punto en que los Comisionados se reuniéron.

Aprovecho esta ocasion para opecer a V las seguridades de la distinguida consideracion de afecmo Servidor. I. S. M.

Adrian Woll.

Copy. Charles Elliot.

[Endorsed]. General Adrian Woll to General Houston. Matamoros 16th July 1843.

Inclosure No 4 to Captain Elliot's Despatch to the Earl of Aberdeen. August 3d, 1843.

HILL TO WOLL⁴⁰

[Enclosure]. Copy. Charles Elliot.

Department of War and Marine

Washington 29th July 1843.

To General Adrian Woll.

Commander in Chief of the Northern Army of Mexico.

Sir,

Your Communication of the 16th July addressed to General Sam Houston, President of the Republic of Texas was by him received on the 26th inst. and referred to this Department for consideration and reply.

Added to the facts set forth in your Communication, the President of the Republic of Texas having been informed through Her Britannic Majesty's Chargé d' Affaires near this Government that Authority had been given to you by President of the Republic of

⁴⁰F. O., Texas, Vol. 6.

Mexico, to act as Military Commissioner on the part of that Government to adjust an Armistice between the two parties, I hasten to inform you in accordance with instructions from His Excellency the President, that according to the suggestions made by you, the proper measures will be adopted on the part of this Government, to Ensure the Appointment of *two* Military Commissioners to meet those who may be appointed by Yourself at the Village of Laredo on the 25th day of September next, or near that time, to Engage in arranging the terms of an Armistice between the parties belligerent.

Orders have been issued in accordance with the proclamation of His Excellency the President of Texas, dated 15th June 1843 (a Copy of which is herewith enclosed) to the Officers Commanding the Forces of the Republic to cease hostilities against Mexico, and Commanding them to observe the requirements of the same.

Owing to the extent of uninhabited territory to the North, and the numerous obstacles which might, by possibility, intercept and cut off communications to the Troops to which you allude as composing the Santa Fé Expedition, they may not have received the proclamation and orders of the President in relation to the suspension of hostilities, to provide against and obviate the interposition of any obstacle from this Cause, to the successful issue of pending Negotiations between the two Governments. I enclose herewith a copy of the Order to Col. Charles A. Warfield revoking authority previously granted, and also an authenticated Copy of the Proclamation declaring an Armistice, with an order to Col. Jacob Snively endorsed thereon, that should those Officers with the forces under their Command, or either of them have appeared, or should in future appear on any portion of the frontier of Mexico, previous to the reception of similar orders through another Channel, you may have it in your power, and which it is hoped you will deem proper to Communicate to them, or either of them (as circumstances may require) these Orders, that they may in obedience thereto, immediately cease hostilities against the Mexican Republic with draw their Forces, and return to the interior Settlements of Texas.

I feel Confident that you will at once perceive the necessity of appointing the time for the meeting of the Commissioners on the part of the two Governments in September next, that the return

of the Troops of this Government, from the North, may be procured, and the Armies of the two Countries with drawn and ordered so as effectually to prevent Collision during the Convention, and ensure the preservation of the consequent suspension of hostilities

A reply at your earliest convenience is solicited, and the time suggested for the meeting of the Commissioners it is hoped will meet your approbation.

I avail myself of this occasion to tender you assurances of the very distinguished Consideration with which I have the honor to be.

Your most obedient Servant
The Secretary of War and Marine of
the Republic of Texas.

G. W. Hill.

A Copy.

Signed, Anson Jones.

ELLIOT TO DOYLE⁴¹

[Enclosure.].

Galveston July 30th 1843.

Extracts from a private letter
to Percy W. Doyle.

My dear Sir,

I have to thank you for your letter of the 8th Instant; and I hope the President will accede to General Santa Aña's arrangement with respect to the Armistice

I look for the answers from Washington by the 1st or 2d Proximo. I am sorry to find from your letter that General Santa Aña still adheres to this point of the acknowledgment of the Sovereignty of Mexico by Texas, not for the sake of Texas, be it understood, for as a matter of private opinion I have long since thought that if the Texians were to consult only *their interests*, they could not do better than to treat upon General Santa Aña's basis. All the advantages are to them, and all the risks and disadvantages (and they are great) are to Mexico. What the *people of Texas* will do, I cannot undertake to say, but it is likely that they will be mainly guided by the feeling in the United

⁴¹F. O., Texas, Vol 6.

States, and it seems quite probable that the arrangement will not be discouraged in that quarter. They would feel there, that it would be the firm and strengthening settlement of a United States population on the Mexican frontier with abundance of pretext to renew disturbances, and extend intrigue and pretensions Westward, as soon as it suited all their convenience to do so; and besides too, it would effectually break up the independence of Texas, which is extremely distasteful in the United States.

Lord Aberdeen's despatch to me of the 3rd Ultimo will place you in possession of the views of Her Majesty's Government at that date. It is much to be wished, (in furtherance of their disposition to be helpful in the adjustment of this Affair) that the Mexican Government may not insist upon the immediate and unqualified acknowledgement of the Sovereignty of Mexico as an indispensable preliminary condition to the opening of Negotiations, but Content itself with an expression of general readiness on the part of the Government maturely to consider any scheme of pacification proposed by Mexico.

General Santa Aña should have regard to the position and difficulties of this Government as well as his own, and if the parties can only agree upon a suitable point de depart in these negotiations I do not quite despair of a satisfactory result.

In considering the chances of such a Solution, it has sometimes occurred to me that if Mexico were to offer to admit the limits of Texas to the line of the Rio Grande, and to grant the Navigation of that river under rules to be agreed upon between the two Governments, that of itself might be a tempting inducement. With regard to the acknowledgment of the Sovereignty of Mexico I suppose the Vocabulary might furnish becoming means of tempering the bitterness of that form of speech. It might be sufficient for example if Texas would [insert] in the Articles of Convention that She was reunited to the Republic of Mexico, and that all Laws, and Decrees passed or issued by the Supreme Congress or Government not at variance with the conditions of the Convention, should be binding upon this Government and people of Texas. Another point of difficulty and delicacy is the treaty making power, and upon that Subject Her Majesty's Government will no doubt express their views at some early date.

Perhaps it would be possible to reconcile the difficulties and exi-

gencies in that respect by an article in the Convention agreeing upon the part of Mexico to the Commercial arrangements which Texas has contracted by treaty with foreign Powers, and further agreeing that Texas should continue to enjoy the rights of a Separate State for all purposes of foreign trade and Commercial intercourse, including the right to conclude and ratify future Conventions respecting foreign trade, and Commercial intercourse. But if Texas is to be left to regulate its trade with other Powers as it sees fit, it follows of course that Mexico should be at liberty to consider Texas a foreign State, in respect to its trade with Mexico, and an article in the Convention, providing for the regulation of this point from time to time according to altering circumstances by Commissioners appointed by the two Governments, would do all that was formally requisite in that respect. I say, formally, for to speak plainly, as soon as there is a State of peace upon the frontier, high tariffs in Mexico, and venal Officers, and active Smugglers on both Sides of the frontier will do all the rest for themselves.

Another point is the flag: In that particular it might be arranged that Texas should retain its own flag within its own territory, and on board of its Merchant Vessels, except in the ports of Mexico, and that therein the Vessels of Texas should wear the flag of Mexico, but be subject to the duties and charges agreed upon in the Convention.

All these are of course mere speculations of my own, and I should particularly say to you that I have never had one word of Conversation with any Member of this Government upon such subjects, but still I have thought it may not be entirely useless to mention them to you. The Commissioners from this Government are Mr. Samuel Williams, and Colonel George Hockley, both of them I believe known to General Santa Aña. Mr. Williams however will be the active Commissioner. He is one of the original Settlers in Texas, and I should think one of the very few men in this country with sense and moderation enough sincerely to regret the Separation from Mexico.

I am persuaded that the Instructions will be as reasonable and as moderate as they can be, due regard being had to General Houston's position, and I am equally persuaded Mr. Williams will be found cordially disposed to do all He can to accomplish some

conclusion of this Affair upon a footing which ought to be satisfactory to the Mexican Government. But I cannot but repeat that General Houston's difficulties at home will be very great indeed; and General Santa Aña should have regard to them, and remember that it may be very easy to destroy his influence by unreasonable uncomplyingness at Mexico, and with it, all hope of a peaceful and moderate Settlement of this dispute.

Whilst I am upon the subject of modes of expression, may I use the freedom to suggest to you that it might be convenient if General Santa Aña and his Government would fall upon some mode of designating General Houston which may leave it in my power to place their communications before him. It cannot be expected of course that they should commit themselves to any tacit acknowledgment of the independence of this Republic by their modes of address, but *General* is not a term of commital, and *Señor Houston* is not a term of suitable respect. General Santa Aña owes General Houston becoming Military respect and courtesy, as well as deep personal gratitude, for he saved his life; and seeing that Her Majesty's Government, and the Government of The King of the French deal with General Houston as General, and President of Texas, I hope we shall hear no more of *Señor Houston* from Mexico. At all events I must decline to be the medium of any Communication from the Government of Mexico which speaks of him as *Señor Houston*, for I feel He would have a right to complain of me if I made myself a party to frivolous incivility of that kind. I observe that the Government of Mexico does speak of the Government of Texas, and therefore upon that score I have no remark to offer.

Galveston August 2d. 1843.

The despatches have just arrived from Washington, and I hope their contents will be satisfactory to the Mexican Government. I learn from Mr. Williams that General Houston wishes that Colonel Hockley and himself should perform the double office of Commissioners to General Woll, for the arrangement of the truce, and then go on to Mexico. Pray strenuously endeavour to persuade General Santa Aña to release the Texian prisoners. No measure would be better calculated to allay angry feeling, and

support the influence of the Govmt. for useful, and modern results.

Charles Elliot.

To Percy W. Doyle, Esqr.

Copy.

Charles Elliot.

[Endorsed.] Inclosure No 6 in Captain Elliot's Despatch to the Earl of Aberdeen. No. 22. August 3d. 1843.

BOOK REVIEWS.

The Life of Thaddeus Stevens, by James Albert Woodburn, Ph. D., Professor of American History and Politics in Indiana University. (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1913. Pp. 620.)

For the greater part of the most momentous decade of our history the figure of "old Thad Stevens" moved conspicuous in the very thickest of political strife. Gifted as few men have been with the powers that make for parliamentary leadership, he impressed his radical views and cynical personality upon nearly all the important policies and legislation of the years 1861 to 1868. There seems to be material in abundance for an adequate biography, and there has long been a need of something more comprehensive than the little volume by McCall in the "American Statesmen" series.

Professor Woodburn disclaims any intention of writing a definitive biography, but has tried to "enable Stevens to speak more fully for himself than he has been allowed to do by others who have treated in a more limited way his principles and policies." The greater part of the volume is in fact drawn directly from the speeches of Stevens on the important subjects of slavery, war finances, and reconstruction policies. This side of the work is well done and the book will be very helpful to the student who wishes to get at Stevens's real views without the toil of exhuming them from the *Congressional Globe*. Beyond this, however, the work is disappointing. The author seems to have drawn his knowledge of the period from a very narrow range of reading; he has fallen completely under the spell of Stevens's brilliant speeches, and betrays not the slightest element of that sympathetic understanding of all sides of great controversies which is so essential to the historian. In this respect he shows far less of balanced and discriminative judgment than McCall whose book is itself not without defects of this sort.

Professor Woodburn seems wholly unable to understand the point of view of the southern men in Congress in the decade preceding the war, but tacitly assumes that Stevens's view of the situation was the correct one. The only other explanation is that

he regards it as his sole duty to set forth the ideas of the Pennsylvania radical without furnishing us any other guide to that political labyrinth. With Stevens's radical opinions on the constitutional issues of the war, Professor Woodburn is in strong sympathy and one of the best chapters of the book deals with this subject. In endorsing Stevens's strictures on Lincoln's cautious policy, he seems unable to appreciate the necessity the president was under of not moving too fast for public opinion. He acknowledges himself a greenbacker, defends his hero's greenback policy with great vigor, and returns to the subject in another chapter at the end of the book. His correction of the mis-statements of certain writers of financial history as to the true policy of Stevens on this subject is conclusive; but McCall had already, though in briefer space, made this clear.

The attitude of the South at the close of the war, especially with reference to the various phases of the negro question he seems no better able to appreciate now than Stevens was then. He upholds the radical leader throughout on the main issues of reconstruction, except upon the last effort at wholesale confiscation of southern property (1867), and only because it was then too late. Nor does he seem able to see that this idea of the wholesale confiscation of the private property of "conquered public enemies" was contrary to the law of nations which according to Stevens was the only law by which the government was bound. While he admits that Stevens was unnecessarily bitter and vindictive toward the South, he excuses it by pointing out that the majority of the people of the North entertained the same feeling. President Johnson, he thinks, was an obstacle to the will of the people that should have been removed by impeachment. His reason for this is that our constitution too rigidly sets the executive apart from the legislative authority and that it should have been "democratized" by making the executive, like the English cabinet, directly responsible through political impeachment to the will of the representatives of the people. How the other necessary adjustments of the constitutional machinery were to be made he does not even suggest. In short, presidents should be removable for political opposition to a majority in congress, though they have violated no law!

The chief objection to the book is that it is lacking in the ele-

ment of broad and scholarly criticism. It is intended solely as a vindication of a leader whose "disregard of the Constitution was a statesmanlike and noble contempt for the restrictions of a parchment that stood in the way of his country's realizing its highest moral ideals," whose part it was "to press forward without regard to squeamish scruples about the Constitution" (P. 237.)

CHAS. W. RAMSDELL.

Lieutenant General Jubal Anderson Early, C. S. A. Autobiographical sketch and Narrative of the War between the States. With notes by R. H. Early. (Philadelphia and London: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1912. Pp. xxvi, 496.)

General Early began the writing of these memoirs very soon after the close of the war and, according to the editor, continued to work at the task until his death in 1894. He was born in Virginia in 1816, graduated at West Point in 1837, resigned from the army to practice law, volunteered and served in the war with Mexico, and again returned to the practice of law in Franklin County, Virginia. He was a Whig, and voted against the ordinance of secession in the Virginia convention in 1861. Immediately thereafter he received a colonel's commission from the State and shortly afterwards from the Confederacy. He participated in the battle of Bull Run and in nearly all the subsequent campaigns of the army under the command of Joseph E. Johnston and Lee.

His narrative aims to give in a general way the operations of the armies, but is mostly confined in detail to the work of his own command and of those acting immediately with him. The general background, the larger strategic problems of the campaigns, are not always made clear enough for the general reader, but the immediate operations and battle experiences of his own command are set forth in photographic clearness of detail. Sometimes, in fact, the details of position and movement are abundant to the border of confusion and leave the reader constantly longing for a map. There are no maps of any sort in the book.

Generally the tone is calm and judicial. General Early refused to be drawn into the unfortunate controversies that arose between certain of the Confederate commanders; but he undertakes to refute, with evident repression of natural asperity, some of the com-

plaints against himself. This is especially true of his campaigns in the Valley in 1864 and 1865. It is in fact hardly necessary to show that he fought against tremendous odds both of men and resources, and that it was necessary at times for him to assume the offensive against superior forces if he was to accomplish what General Lee desired. It is interesting to note that he had no very high opinion of Sheridan, whose reputation was largely based upon this Valley campaign, and attributes his escape "from utter annihilation [at Winchester] to the incapacity of my opponent." The rout of his army at Cedar Creek, he attributes chiefly to the demoralization of his troops by their plundering of the captured Federal camp. Even here, Sheridan showed no vigor in pursuit.

General Early avows his own responsibility for the burning of Chambersburg which was in partial retaliation for the devastations wrought by the Union armies. He shows considerable feeling in denying the charges of "rebel atrocities," particularly concerning the treatment of prisoners, and describes vividly the hardships and suffering of the southern people both at home and in the field.

Perhaps the publication of these memoirs will add little to the knowledge of the critical student of military science, but they are interesting reading and do much to clear Early's name from some of the charges of incapacity so freely indulged in by certain writers of military history.

CHAS. W. RAMSDELL.

Dr. William Le Roy Broun, compiled by Thomas L. Broun, assisted by Bessie Lee Broun and Sally F. Ordway. (New York: The Neale Publishing Company, 1912. Pp. 247.)

William Le Roy Broun, was the first professor of mathematics in the University of Texas, and was one of the eight distinguished men who formed the first faculty of the University, 1883-84. Upon the resignation of Professor Mallet, the first Chairman of the Faculty (the University had no president until 1896), Professor Broun was elected Chairman, but owing to the death of his wife and because of friends and relatives in Alabama, he resigned to become, as the event proved, the highly successful president of the Alabama Polytechnic Institute (A. and M. College) from 1884 to his death in 1902. This account of him compiled by three of his children

is therefore of interest to Texans, particularly to the older alumni and ex-students of the University.

This compilation contains a brief summary of Dr. Broun's life, a number of letters and memoranda of his concerning the lives of his family and of himself, some seventy pages of letters and articles by friends written before and after his death, and about one hundred and forty pages of extracts from his numerous addresses on various subjects.

The volume reveals Dr. Broun as a wise and gentle, witty and friendly man who was one of the South's great educators during the period between the War and 1900. Like nearly all Southerners of his generation he served through the war, which began when he was 34 years of age. He rose to the rank of Lieutenant Colonel in the ordnance department, and like Lee, retired from the army to become a teacher. He was a Master of Arts of the University of Virginia and was professor of natural philosophy in the University of Georgia, 1866-72; president of the Georgia A. and M. 1872-75; professor of Mathematics, Vanderbilt, 1875-82. Alabama Polytechnic, against great difficulties, he made into a worthy institution. Dr. Mallet and Dr. Humphreys each accord him much weight in the formative policies of the infant University of Texas. Among other things he successfully opposed the giving of "honors" upon competition, and he was largely concerned in drawing up the first requirements for the various degrees. Previously Dr. Broun had been a member of the early Vanderbilt University faculty and had performed similar services for that institution. Professor Joynes of South Carolina College, after an acquaintance of fifty years describes him as "the foremost representative . . . of his generation of the Southern gentleman, scholar and teacher," and his last pastor writes that he believed in the "Patriotism of Efficiency."

H. Y. B.

General Laws of the State of Texas passed by the Thirty-third Legislature at its regular session . . . 1913. Secretary of State, Austin, 1913. 8vo. Pp. 484. Paper 20 cents; by mail, 35 cents. The delivery of the first installment of these laws was made June 13. Some of the acts having historical interest are those creating Jim Hogg county out of portions of Brooks and Duval;

Kleberg county out of a portion of Nueces; and Real county out of portions of Bandera, Edwards, and Kerr. Another act forbids the use of any device of the Texas flag for advertising purposes. An act provides for Gonzales State Park, a portion of the original four leagues granted to the municipality of Gonzales; another act looks toward the acquisition of Fannin's Battle Ground and the La Bahia Mission property.

Under the title "The President's Silent Partner" *Collier's Weekly* of May 3, 1913, presents a personality sketch of Edward M. House, by Peter Clark Macfarlane.

A biographical sketch of State Senator Julius Real, in whose honor Real county was named, was printed in the *Austin Statesman*, April 20, 1913.

Mrs. A. B. Looscan, of Houston, has presented to the State Library a broadside "In Memoriam" of Colonel John A. Williams, issued by the officers of the Buffalo Bayou, Brazos and Colorado Railroad, of which corporation he was chief engineer and superintendent. He was born at Brookline, Connecticut, in 1825, removed to Texas in 1851, and died of yellow fever September 15, 1867. During the Civil War he attained the rank of Colonel of Engineers, C. S. A.

NEWS ITEMS.

At the meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association at Omaha, May 8-10, it was decided to inaugurate *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*. The first number will appear in October. Professor Clarence W. Alvord of the University of Illinois is to be managing editor. Other members of the editorial board are Benjamin F. Shambaugh of the University of Iowa, Reuben Gold Thwaites of the Wisconsin State Library, Archer B. Hulbert of Marietta College, James A. James of Northwestern University, Walter L. Fleming of Louisiana State University, Orrin G. Libby of the University of North Dakota, Claude H. Van Tyne of the University of Michigan, and Eugene C. Barker of the University of Texas.

The Charleston (S. C.) Library Society is appealing for aid in the erection of a fireproof building to house its very valuable historical collections. The Library was founded in 1748 and contains 42,000 volumes and 10,050 pamphlets, including files of important South Carolina papers from 1732 to the present. The Society has already collected in the city of Charleston \$33,000; "about one-half of the sum needed." The safekeeping of this collection is important to every citizen of the United States who is interested in the history of the country. Contributions may be sent to J. Arthur Johnston, Treasurer of the Building Fund, Charleston, S. C.

General R. M. Gano died at Dallas, March 27, 1913. He was born in Bourbon county, Kentucky, June 18, 1830; graduated from Bethany College, 1849, and later from the Medical University of Louisville; located at Baton Rouge, but in 1857 removed to Tarrant county, Texas. In 1861 he resigned his seat in the legislature and raised a company to serve the Confederacy. He rose from the position of captain to that of major-general.

J. L. German, a member of the Texas constitutional convention of 1875, died at Whitewright, Texas, April 19, 1913. He was born May 8, 1835, in Morgan county, Missouri; was educated in

the Missouri State University, and served under General Sterling Price during the Civil War. A brief sketch of his life is printed in the *Dallas News* of April 26, 1913.

Charles Keith Bell died at his home in Fort Worth, April 22, 1913. He was born in Chattanooga, Tennessee, April 18, 1853; removed to Texas in 1871, and served in turn as district attorney, state senator, district judge, member of congress and attorney general of Texas. A sketch of his life appears in the *Dallas News* of April 23.

A. C. Gray died at Houston, June 11, 1913. He was born at Fredericksburg, Virginia, October 4, 1830, and came to Texas in 1838. In 1873 he became the owner and editor of the *Houston Telegraph*, and until January of this year was the senior member of the printing house of Gray-Dillaye and Company of Houston. He was a Fellow of the Texas State Historical Association. A sketch of his life appears in the *Houston Post*, June 12, 1913.

161

THE SOUTHWESTERN HISTORICAL QUARTERLY

Vol. XVII.*

OCTOBER, 1913

No. 2

The publication committee and the editors disclaim responsibility for views expressed by contributors to THE QUARTERLY.

THE MOVEMENT FOR STATE DIVISION IN CALIFORNIA, 1849-1860

WILLIAM HENRY ELLISON

Between the calling of the constitutional convention in 1849 and the meeting of the legislature in 1860, various efforts were made to divide California by a line running east and west. Writers on the history of California have obscured the real significance of the division movement by making it an incident in the national slavery controversy. Further investigation, however, reveals the incidental character of the slavery issue in the movement, and the priority of the struggle for the adjustment of local interests in a newly formed frontier.

The whole movement of population westward in the United States has been attended by conflicts of classes, nationalities, and developing interests. In particular has the struggle been manifest in the efforts of the older communities to retain a preponderance of control in determining social, economic, and political forms in which national or state life has found expression, as against the newer communities struggling to free themselves from that control, or rather to determine their own forms of expression.

The movement for the division of California in the first decade of the state's history was a part of this struggle known as sectionalism. But the struggle here had phases peculiar to itself, by reason of California's early settlement by the Spaniards, and of the sudden influx of a great new population, with interests and traditions

*Volumes I-XV published as THE QUARTERLY of the Texas State Historical Association.

different from those of the old, and so powerful that, instead of the newer community, as was usual, it was the older that was forced to struggle for equality and justice.

Before the discovery of gold, the dominant, almost the sole, interest in California was pastoral and agricultural. The province was held, in great estates, by a slender population subsisting easily by raising stock and grain. By far the larger portion of the population lived in the southern district. But with the discovery of gold the centers of population shifted to the north and to the Sierras, where the dominant interest was in the mines, and where the lands were not owned, but leased. In the middle of 1848, it is estimated, there were in California about 7500 Hispano-Californians, 6500 Americans, and a negligible number of foreigners.¹ By the end of 1849 the population had increased to about 100,000, most of whom were newcomers seeking for gold. The sparse population of the southern part of the territory was still made up largely of Hispano-Californians, satisfied with old conditions, and glad to be left free to enjoy their landed estates. To these there was gradually added a new element, also interested primarily in agricultural and grazing pursuits. The two sections, therefore, were manifestly divergent, one an old, Mexican, sparsely settled, land-owning community, the other a new and numerous mining people, who leased their lands.

I. THE MOVEMENT FOR DIVISION BEFORE ADMISSION TO STATEHOOD

Under the military régime of the United States inaugurated by Commodore Sloat, when in July, 1846, he took Monterey and proclaimed California free from Mexican rule and a territory of the United States, there was not much occasion for sectionalism, and little opportunity for its expression within California territory. But the changes in population and interests which took place during the next three years prepared the way for a sectional struggle. A part of the American population, restless under military rule, with its few offices for which to run, and feeling the need for a well-organized civil government, especially after the influx of population due to the gold excitement, set about securing what they desired. Through the interest of President Taylor, the co-operation

¹Bancroft, *History of California*, VI, 71, note.

of the military authorities in charge, and the zeal of some of the newly arrived citizens, those interested in civil government were able to see a convention gathered in Monterey September 3, 1849, for the purpose of forming a constitution for California.² With this convention began the phase of the sectional struggle in California with which this paper deals.

1. *In the Constitutional Convention.*—The representation from the southern districts in the constitutional convention was about one-fourth the number from the whole territory. Seven members of the convention were native-born Californians. The greater number of the other members had been in California but a short time.³

It immediately became evident that the people of southern California did not desire to have their fortunes linked in civil government with the territory further north.

William M. Gwin, in his *Memoirs*, says of the attitude of the convention: "When they met to organize, the members showed a strange distrust of the motives of each other from various sections. The old settled portions of California sent members to the convention to vote against the formation of a state government. They were afraid of the newcomers, who formed a vast majority of the voting population."⁴

In the preliminary discussion of September 5, the delegates from the southern section made their sentiments regarding this point known to the convention. At that time, the question arose as to whether the constitution to be formed was to be for a state or a territorial government. Some seemed to think it was understood that the purpose of the convention was to form a constitution for a state government. The chairman pointed out that Governor Riley in his proclamation referred to a territorial as well as to a state government.⁵ Mr. Carrillo, a native Californian from the Santa Barbara district, said

that he represented one of the most respectable communities in California, and he did not believe it to be to the interest of his

²Bancroft, *History of California*, VI, 291-302.

³Browne, *Report of the Debates in the Convention of California on the Formation of the State Constitution*, 478, 479.

⁴Gwin, *Memoirs*, MS., 11 (in the Bancroft Collection).

⁵Browne, *Debates*, 21, 22.

constituents that a State Government should be formed. At the same time, as a great majority of this convention appeared to be in favor of a State Government, he proposed that the country should be divided by running a line west from San Luis Obispo, so that all north of that line might have a State Government, and all south thereof a Territorial Government.⁶

Further on in the discussion he said:

that he conceived it to be to the interests of his constituents, if a Territorial Government could not be formed for the whole country, that the country should be so divided as to allow them that form, while the northern population might adopt a State Government if they preferred it.⁷

When the vote was taken on the question of a state or a territorial government, 28 voted for and 8 against the formation of a state constitution. All six of the delegates who were present and voting from the extreme southern districts voted against the formation of a state government. A delegate from Monterey and one representing the San Jose district joined these.

The reason why the delegates from the southern districts desired their section to be left in the territorial condition was brought out in the debates on the representation of districts and on taxation. The native land-holding class felt that the representation should be on a basis that would take into consideration the permanence of their interests and the transitoriness of those of the population in the San Joaquin and Sacramento valleys. They saw the difference between a settled, land-holding class and a transitory population, and believed that injustice could easily be done the permanent class.⁸ The issue was even clearer when the subject of taxation was being discussed. It was revealed by this discussion that the people in the south⁹ had feared from the first that a state government would bear heavily upon them, and that they therefore wanted a territorial

⁶*Ibid.*, 22.

⁷Browne, *Debates*, 22, 23.

⁸*Ibid.*, 400-416.

⁹The terms "north" and "south" when used in this paper refer to northern and southern California, respectively, unless capitalized, in which case they refer to national sectional divisions.

government, under which taxation would not be a burden.¹⁰ So great was the dissatisfaction of the southern delegates over what they believed were prospects of burdensome taxation that it was feared for a time that they would leave the convention and break it up. In speaking of the discussion and the situation at the time when taxation was the subject of debate, Gwin says:

It was impossible to avoid saying in the Constitution that the taxation should be equal, but the delegates from the settled portions of the state, who had land grants, and represented those who had vast grants of land from Spain and Mexico, would not listen to any proposition that would subject their real estate to taxation and the onus of supporting the state, while the great bulk of the population, the newcomers, had no real estate, in fact nothing that could be taxed, and nothing could be collected of them except a poll tax.¹¹

Gwin goes on to state that in order to prevent the withdrawal of the representatives of the landed interests from the convention, a compromise was made by passing the provision which appears in the constitution giving *constitutional power* to local assessors of the counties, and to the boards of supervisors elected by the landholders themselves and those they could influence, this being a guaranty against their being taxed oppressively.¹²

2. *Admission opposed in southern California, and division asked.*—The southern delegates remained in the convention and joined in its work; but it is evident that there was much dissatisfaction in the south with what was done in the convention, for in the early part of 1850 there was a movement on foot there to protest against the admission of California into the Union and to formulate plans for a division of the state. On February 10, 1850, a meeting was held in Los Angeles in this interest and a committee was appointed to formulate resolutions.¹³ On March 3, a large meeting was held on the plaza at the corner of the house of Don Ignacio del Valle. The main object of the meeting was to sign a petition against the admission of California with its proposed boundaries, and, in effect, to leave the southern part of the state

¹⁰Browne, *Debates*, 446.

¹¹Gwin, *Memoirs*, MS., 28, 29 (in Bancroft Collection).

¹²*Ibid.*, 28, 29.

¹³Cota, *Doc. Hist. Cal.*, MS. (Bancroft Collection), pp. 25-36.

as a territory. The petition was generally signed by the citizens.¹⁴ A letter containing the resolutions passed at this meeting was sent to San Luis Obispo, San Diego,¹⁵ and Santa Barbara.¹⁶

The petition, which was addressed to the Congress of the United States, gave reasons for the division suggested and presented arguments against the admission of the state with its proposed boundaries. It is of importance to refer to the reasons stated and arguments presented, for they continued to be urged with force for a decade by the people of southern California. The petition stated first the opposition of the southern section to the formation of a state government in the beginning, as was indicated by the votes of their delegates in the constitutional convention. One of the principal reasons given for their position was the lack of acquaintance of the former inhabitants with the character of American institutions because of the short time since the treaty of Querétaro. It was further set forth that the expenses of a state government must necessarily bear heavily upon landholders, even to working their ruin; the extent of territory, with dissimilar resources, was too great for a single state; the thinly populated south would be under the complete control, in political matters, of the northern part of the state with its many material advantages and large transient population; the great distance from the northern to the southern end of California territory would not only put a burden upon the south, but would also be an inconvenience to its people. For these reasons, Congress was petitioned to separate the southern part of the state from the north by a line beginning in the Pacific Ocean and drawn so as to include the district of San Luis Obispo and the regions to the south thereof, and that such section be

¹⁴*Hayes Collection*, 43:5 (in Bancroft Library). The Hayes Collection in the Bancroft Library, collected by the late Judge Benjamin Hayes, consists of (1) manuscripts and (2) of some 135 volumes of newspaper clippings, speeches, reports of various legislative committees, laws, miscellaneous materials on all phases of life and history in the west, particularly in California. "California" I. and II. bear on California politics. "California Constitutional Law" is a volume containing clippings referring to various efforts to modify the laws of the state, particularly by state division. It contains many clippings from newspapers throughout the state, and in particular from southern California, prominent among which are the *Los Angeles Star*, *San Diego Herald*, and *Southern Vineyard*. It is cited by Bancroft as *Hayes' Constitutional Law*.

¹⁵Cota, pp. 25-36.

¹⁶*Santa Barbara Archives*, 229, 230 (in Bancroft Collection).

erected into a territory to be known as the Territory of Southern California.¹⁷

3. *Attempts in Congress to divide California.*—The efforts made in Congress to divide the territory included in California before the admission of any part of it presented issues apart, in the main, from the issues being contested in California itself, but since the two contests have some points of contact, a brief discussion of the Congressional struggle is in place here.

When late in 1849 the newly elected representatives and senators¹⁸ from California began their journey to the national capital to present their credentials and to ask for the admission of the state into the Union, they were not unaware of the excited and divided state of public feeling in the East over the slavery question. On their arrival, they learned that President Taylor, in his annual message to Congress, announced that he had reason to believe that California had organized a state government and would soon seek admission into the Union, and that he recommended that the application be favorably received.¹⁹ On the 13th of February, having received from the California delegation an official copy of California's constitution, President Taylor submitted the proposed constitution to Congress.²⁰ From the debate which occurred at the time, and from repeated objections to the free constitution of California, and because of suggestions that California might be admitted as far south as the line of 36 degrees 30 minutes,²¹ the California delegates saw that their petition for the admission of the state was certain to meet determined opposition. To meet the objections to admitting the state with the proposed boundaries, the senators and representatives elect from California prepared a memorial addressed to the senate and house of representatives. It was presented on March 13 by Senator Douglas.²²

The memorial recited the early history of California, told of its gradual development, of its Mexican population, and of its acquisi-

¹⁷*Hayes' Constitutional Law*, 1 (in Bancroft Collection); Vallejo, *Documentos Para la Hist. de Cal.*, MSS. (Bancroft Collection), 13:39.

¹⁸Senators, John C. Fremont and William M. Gwin; Representatives, Edward Gilbert and George W. Wright.

¹⁹*Congressional Globe*, 31st Congress, 1st Session, Part I, 71.

²⁰*Ibid.*, 347.

²¹*Congressional Globe*, 31st Congress, 1st Session, Part I, 367.

²²*Ibid.*, 515.

tion by the United States. Then followed an account of the discovery of gold and the inrush of settlers as a result of the discovery, of the waiting on Congress for a territorial government, and of the determination of the people that some form of civil government must be had for their protection. Next came an account of the constitutional convention and the organization of the state government. Upon the question which caused all the difficulties in Congress, the California delegates had this to say:

Much misapprehension appears to have obtained in the Atlantic states relative to the question of slavery in California. The undersigned have no hesitation in saying that the provision in the constitution excluding that institution meets with the almost unanimous approval of that people. . . . Since the discovery of the mines, the feeling in opposition to the introduction of slavery is believed to have become, if possible, more unanimous than before. . . . There is no doubt, moreover, that two-fifths of those who voted in favor of the constitution were recent emigrants from slave-holding states. . . .

The question of the [eastern] boundary called out the most vehement and angry debate which was witnessed during the sitting of the convention. The project of fixing the southern boundary of the state on the parallel of 36° 30' was never entertained by that body.²³

The expression of a purpose to divide California before it was admitted came early in the congressional discussion of the subject. One of the chief spokesmen for division was Senator Foote. He said that he was in favor of admitting all of California north of the parallel of 36 degrees and 30 minutes.²⁴ On May 9, he announced to the Senate the receipt of a letter telling of the meeting in Los Angeles in which a protest was made against admission and a desire expressed for a territorial government for the southern part of the state. At the same time, he presented a letter from a state senator of Los Angeles, addressed to one of the senators elect from California, in which the writer declared the opposition to statehood to be largely on the part of the old California residents, and urged that the protest be not taken seriously. The communications were not received by the Senate because they were addressed to individuals and not to the body, which caused objections to their recep-

²³Willey, *Transition Period of California*, 129-133.

²⁴*Congressional Globe*, 31st Congress, 1st Session, Part I, 367.

tion.²⁵ In the letter to Senator Foote, the writer, who had written in haste, indicated that documents would follow. There seems to be no record that the petition of the citizens was later presented.

The debate on the admission of California lasted all summer. During its progress, various efforts were made to provide for a division before consent for admission would be given. On August 1, Senator Foote offered an amendment to an amendment which had been proposed by Senator Douglas concerning public lands. Foote suggested that a division of California should be made by a line running along the parallel of 35 degrees 30 minutes, the southern part thus cut off to become the territory of Colorado. The amendment was lost by a vote of 23 ayes and 33 noes.²⁶ On August 6, Senator Turney offered an amendment which provided that when the inhabitants of California in convention assembled should establish as a southern boundary a line not farther south than the parallel of 36 degrees 30 minutes, the state of California might be admitted into the Union, on the proclamation of the President. This amendment also provided for the extension of the Missouri Compromise line to the Pacific Ocean. The Senate rejected this amendment by a vote of 24 ayes and 32 noes.²⁷

Then Foote proposed an additional section. This provided that, as soon as practicable after the passage of the act admitting it as a state, California should ascertain by vote the feelings of its people on the question of so modifying the boundaries of the state as to make the line of 36 degrees 30 minutes, or some other line fixed by them, its southern boundary. It further provided that, when the people should declare for such a modification of boundaries by a majority vote, the portion cut off should at once become the territory of Colorado.²⁸ On August 10, Senator Turney made another futile attempt to restrict the state to the portion falling above the line of 36 degrees 30 minutes.²⁹

An examination of the proposals made will show a gradation. When it was seen that California's application for statehood was looked upon with favor by many, there were efforts to bring about

²⁵*Ibid.*, 967.

²⁶*Congressional Globe*, 31st Congress, 1st Session, Appendix, II, 485.

²⁷*Ibid.*, 1510, 1511.

²⁸*Congressional Globe*, 31st Congress, 1st Session, Appendix II, 1511.

²⁹*Ibid.*, 1519-1522.

division of the territory included in the proposed state. First an arbitrary division by Congress was proposed. When this plan was defeated, it was suggested that a convention of Californians should be given the privilege of deciding to limit the state above the line of 36 degrees and 30 minutes north latitude, whereupon the state would be admitted by proclamation of the President. When this failed to carry, it was proposed that the Californians be allowed to use their judgment as to the expediency of making a part of their state into a territory, without further action by Congress. But none of the proposals looking to division carried, and the bill admitting the state with boundaries as proposed in its constitution passed the Senate on August 13, the vote being 34 ayes and 18 noes.⁸⁰

On September 7, the bill from the Senate came up in the House, where its passage was strenuously resisted. Strong opposition was shown to the admission of that part of California south of the Missouri Compromise line. On this, the last day of the bill's consideration, Thompson of Mississippi, who earlier in the session had spoken in favor of limiting the boundaries of the state line on the south to the parallel of 36 degrees 30 minutes, made a final speech of opposition to admission with the proposed constitutional boundaries. In his last plea he said, "the adoption of a territorial government for South California is demanded by the people of that country. The whole south asks for the division as an act of justice. Every consideration of sound policy demands this division."⁸¹ But the bill, after several dilatory motions and votes, passed the House by a vote of 156 yeas to 56 nays. It was signed by the President September 9.

It is thus seen that while the movement in Congress for division was a part of the national slavery struggle, and quite distinct in character from the movement in California, the Southern Congressmen tried to use the California contest to further their own purposes.

⁸⁰*Ibid.*, 1542.

⁸¹Wiley, *The Transition Period of California*, 158.

II. THE MOVEMENT AS CULMINATING IN THE LEGISLATURE OF
1852 AND 1853

1. *The convention of 1851.*—The objection to state government, and particularly to the union of northern and southern California under a single government, continued to find expression in California in a persistent effort to bring about a division of the state. An important period in this movement includes the first three years of California's statehood. When it was seen that the efforts to prevent admission were fruitless, definite plans were made to secure division.¹ It was thought that a convention to discuss the situation would furnish a proper and effective means for crystallizing sentiment in regard to the movement.²

By the month of August, 1851, plans had taken somewhat definite form. In Los Angeles County all the candidates for the legislature pledged themselves to use their efforts to obtain a division of the state. The same test was to be made in other counties.³ Mr. Agostín Haraszthy, a prominent citizen of Southern California, who, acting for those opposing admission, had written to Senator Foote⁴ the sentiments of the south, set forth in a communication to the press some arguments of the divisionists. He said that there must be two sets of laws, one for the north and one for the south; the northern members of the legislature could have no interest in laws for the southern counties and *vice versa*; the distances of travel were so great as to impose an unnecessary burden of time and money upon the people of the south in the transaction of public and private business; different laws for the people and differing salaries for officials of different sections were a necessity; the south was an agricultural section, where the people were unable to pay the taxes necessary for supporting the extensive state system of government; and unless division should take place, the people of southern California would be impoverished and driven away, and, as a result, little but the land would be left in the south.⁵ These arguments, it is seen, are essentially the same as

¹*Los Angeles Star*, October, 1851, in *Hayes' Constitutional Law*, 1.

²*Vallejo Docs.*, 35:262.

³*Los Angeles Star*, August 23, 1851, in *Hayes' Constitutional Law*, 6.

⁴See above, p. 10.

⁵*San Francisco Daily Herald*, August 16, 1851.

those which had been put forth in the constitutional convention and in the memorial to Congress.

That injustice was really being done to the southern part of the state seemed to be widely recognized at the time, both north and south.⁶ It was known that many persons had left southern California for Mexico to get away from what they believed to be the oppressions of the state government in the matter of taxation.⁷ There was a widespread feeling that in the enactment of laws, the wishes of the people in the south were not consulted and their interests seldom cared for. The northern part of the state admitted that the southern section was the most sparsely represented, and, in proportion to their means, the most heavily taxed portion of the state, while in the disposition of the general officers, neither party deemed the south worth conciliating even by a nomination. In short, the people of southern California were treated as step-children and they murmured.⁸ They did not feel that it was possible for their section to have a representation that would place them on a fair footing with respect to the mining portions of the state.⁹ To feel that they, long resident in the state, were being heavily taxed and regarded with little consideration, while the mining interests were courted and caressed,¹⁰ was not pleasant to the native Californians. Their objection to statehood came naturally out of their feeling that they were treated more like a conquered province than as a free and independent state,¹¹ and the opinion that division was the only remedy for the ills suffered became quite general.¹²

The feelings of the people of the south found expression in action. The *Daily Alta California*, which had opposed every move to secure division of the state, in its issue of August 9, 1851, admitted that the movement to divide the state had gathered force, and

⁶*Daily Alta California*, August 2, 1851.

⁷*Ibid.*, August 19, 1851; *Los Angeles Star*, September 23, 1851, in *Hayes' Constitutional Law*, 2.

⁸*San Francisco Daily Herald*, August 8, 1851.

⁹*Los Angeles Star*, September 23, 1851, in *Hayes' Constitutional Law*, 1, 2.

¹⁰*Ibid.*

¹¹*Ibid.*, August 23, in *Hayes' Constitutional Law*, 6.

¹²*Ibid.*, August 2; *Daily Alta California*, September 25, 1851; *San Francisco Daily Herald*, August 8, 1851; *San Diego Herald*, September 4, 1851, in *Hayes' Constitutional Law*, 2.

published the plans being made for a convention to meet at Los Angeles, Santa Barbara, or Monterey to discuss the proposal.¹³ Owing to the extent of territory, it was difficult to secure concerted action in regard to the time and place of holding a convention. The first proposal was to hold the gathering at Monterey on the 15th of September, and arrangements were made for the meeting.¹⁴ Then a committee of citizens of San Diego held a meeting, August 30, in which Santa Barbara was suggested as the place for holding the convention, and the third Monday of October named as the date.¹⁵

The meeting at San Diego, in addition to urging the wisdom of a convention, gave to the public, in the form of resolutions, reasons for dividing the state. It was stated that

the great extent of the territory of the State, spreading itself over so many degrees of latitude along our sea coast, producing by the simple laws of nature such a vast difference of climate, . . . necessarily producing as great a diversity of industrial pursuits, and these differences being augmented by the natural formation and deposits of the Northern and Southern divisions of the country, have created and will ever create an utter impossibility for any Legislature of the State, however wise and patriotic, to enact laws adapted to the wants and necessities of a people, so widely differing in their circumstances and pursuits.

Besides this, it was urged that there were differences in means of transportation of the north and the south, the north having the advantage in its splendid streams of water, which reduce the cost of transportation; the means of transportation in the south were expensive, so that the agricultural products brought the people a bare subsistence. Because of these differences, it was argued that "any revenue law which levies the same per cent upon the dollar must fall heavier upon the lower than upon the upper country. This being the case, while the latter may sustain themselves under the burden of heavy taxation, the former will be oppressed and in the end absolutely impoverished."¹⁶ In order to relieve themselves of

¹³*Daily Alta California*, August 9, 1851.

¹⁴*Daily Alta California*, September 25, 1851.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, September 12, 1851. *San Francisco Daily Herald*, September 11, 1851.

¹⁶*San Francisco Daily Herald*, September 11, 1851; *Daily Alta California*, September 12, 1851.

the burden, the citizens had called the meeting to take into consideration the means of changing the civil status of the south.

In Los Angeles a public meeting, presided over by the mayor, was held on September 12 to urge division and make plans for a convention. The resolutions adopted begin:

Whereas, Experience has demonstrated that the political connection, which exists between the North and the South of California is beneficial to neither and prejudicial to both, therefore,

Resolved, That we, the citizens of Los Angeles County, will use every effort to produce a separation of the Southern portion of the State from the Northern, and the establishment of a separate and distinct Government.

The reasons given for a separation are similar to those given in the San Diego resolutions. The convention was invited to meet in Los Angeles because Santa Barbara had no public press.¹⁷

An attempt was made to hold the convention at Monterey as at first proposed. Owing to the misunderstanding about time and place, when it met in October there was not a full representation, but the delegates who were present issued an address in favor of division and stated their reasons for their position.¹⁸ Their address was dated October 8. It declared that in the beginning of the agitation for a state government, it had been feared that an attempt to form a constitution for so large a state would result in confusion, and that the laboring classes and property holders not situated in the gold districts would have to bear the larger portion of the cost of government; such had been the result; laws had been unjust and oppressive to a portion of the state; laws passed by the legislature had not been lawfully promulgated; disparity in taxation existed. and as long as the state remained so large, the government would be oppressive to a portion of the people.¹⁹

It was finally agreed in the south that a convention should assemble at Santa Barbara on the third Monday of October, and to it delegates were quite generally elected.²⁰ All the southern counties were represented except Santa Clara and Santa Cruz. Three of the delegates elected from Monterey did not go, fearing

¹⁷*Los Angeles Star*, September 13, 1851, in *Hayes' Constitutional Law*, 7.

¹⁸*San Francisco Daily Herald*, September 17 and October 12, 1851.

¹⁹*San Francisco Daily Herald*, October 12, 1851.

²⁰*Daily Alta California*, October 13, 1851.

there would be no quorum present because of the misunderstanding about the place of meeting. The delegates met at the appointed place and opened the convention on October 20, remaining in session four days.²¹ The delegates present were as follows: From San Diego, W. C. Ferrell, Cave J. Coutts, Agostín Haraszthy, G. P. Tibbets, P. C. Carrillo, Joaquin Ortega, T. W. Sutherland, and Antonio María Ortega; from Los Angeles, B. D. Wilson, J. L. Brent, John A. Lewis, Ignacio del Valle, A. F. Coronel, I. S. K. Ogier, Leonce Hoover, Francisco O'Campo, José Antonio Carrillo, Hugo Reid, Thomas Sánchez, and Jefferson Hunt; from Santa Barbara, Henry Carnes, Joaquin Carrillo, A. M. de la Guerra, C. R. V. Lee, Anastasia Carrillo, Samuel Barney, Estévan Ardisson, V. W. Hearn, Juan Camarillo, and Octaviana Gutiérrez; from Monterey, Frederick Russell.²² These names are given to show the composition of the convention. They speak for themselves. Fifteen clearly show their Spanish origin. Two others at least had Mexican wives.

The sessions of the convention were taken up with the discussion of what the people of the southern part of the state desired, and the formulation of their reasons therefor. The resolutions reported from the committee pointed to the necessities which gave a government to the state, but charged that the government erected and giving security and happiness to one section of the state had been obtained through the sacrifices of the other section, and that while the favored section, under the government provided, increased in all the elements which constitute the greatness of a state, the other gathered bitter experiences. They urged the dissolution of a political union which was antagonistic to the various interests which society had built up and which was "in contradiction to the eternal ordinances of nature, who herself had marked with an unerring hand the natural bounds between the great gold regions of the northern and internal sections of the state and the rich and agricultural valleys of the south." It was said that the results of experience had demonstrated that no uniform system of civil, criminal, or revenue laws could be provided whereby the wants and requirements of the entire state could be satisfied; and a desire was expressed for the "forma-

²¹*San Francisco Daily Herald*, October 26 and 28, 1851.

²²*Los Angeles Star*, November 1, 1851, in *Hayes' Constitutional Law*, 29.

tion of a territorial government in the southern counties of California under the paternal guardianship of the General Government."²³

Upon the necessity for a division of the state to insure justice to the southern portion, the convention was unanimous. The only matter upon which there was serious division was that of exact boundaries. After discussions and divisions which nearly broke up the convention, it was agreed to recommend to the legislature that in designating a boundary for the proposed southern territory,

the line should run from a point not farther north than the northwestern boundary line of Santa Clara county, nor further south than the northern boundary of Monterey county, east to the main coast range of mountains, thence along said range of mountains, to a point due west of the northernmost point of the great Tulare Lake, thence due east to the point of said Lake, thence northeast to the eastern boundary line of the present State of California, thence down said boundary line, in a southeast direction to the boundary between Mexico and the United States, thence along said boundary line to the Pacific Ocean, thence following up the coast to the place of beginning, including the adjacent Islands on the coast—and that only such agricultural and grazing counties as are identified with us in interest, be included in said boundaries.²⁴

The general unanimity of the convention, and the frank, full statement in the resolutions of the conditions which were regarded as existing, made the people in the northern part of the state recognize the movement to divide the state as an important one. It was seen that questions had been presented that must be met by the legislature; and it was anticipated that they would be among the most important to come before that body at its next session.²⁵

2. *Misunderstanding of the California situation in the East.*—After the admission of California and the beginning of agitation for a division of the state, there was some discussion in eastern papers as to the significance of the movement. Rumors from the East in September, 1851, indicated that agitation was rife in certain quarters for securing for slavery more territory, such as Cuba and certain provinces of Mexico, together with a part of California,

²³*San Francisco Daily Herald*, October 26 and 28, 1851.

²⁴*San Francisco Daily Herald*, October 26 and 28, 1851; *Los Angeles Star*, November 1, 1851, in *Hayes' Constitutional Law*, 29.

²⁵*Daily Alta California*, October 29, 1851.

which was to be divided for that purpose.²⁶ In parts of the East, this agitation and the California division movement were treated as parts of the same problem. In discussing General Morehead's expedition into Mexico, the *New York Courier and Enquirer* claimed that a portion of the people of the Pacific Coast were agitating division for the purpose of erecting another state in which slavery should be permitted, and that there was a plan to induce a revolt in the province of Sonora or in Lower California, with the purpose of ultimately attaching this to the southern portion of California in order to form a new slave state on the Pacific Coast.²⁷ But on the Pacific Coast it was asserted by the anti-divisionists that General Morehead's expedition had nothing to do with the division of California. More than this, the persons who favored state division were believed to look with disfavor on the acquisition of Lower California. And in any case, Lower California was known to be unsuited to slave labor.²⁸ It was recognized, it is true, by many on the Pacific Coast, that to divide California might open up the discussion of the slavery question.²⁹ But in California, in the various meetings and conventions of the year 1851, there was an entire absence of reference to the slavery matter.

3. *The question in the legislature of 1852.*—In the years 1852 and 1853, the movement for state division found voice in the state legislature. Here it became a potent factor in the attempts to provide for the calling of a constitutional convention for the purpose of revising the entire constitution of the state, it having been stated during the agitation of the previous year, by members of the legal profession, that a general convention of the people of the whole state would be necessary before separation could take place. It was suggested that at such a convention boundaries could be established, and attention given to other questions more or less connected with the division of the state.³⁰

Governor McDougall, an Ohio man living at Sacramento, in his message to the legislature at the beginning of the session of 1852,

²⁶*Daily Alta California*, September 2, 1851.

²⁷*Ibid.*, November 25, 1851; *San Francisco Daily Herald*, September 16, 1851.

²⁸*Los Angeles Star*, in *San Francisco Herald*, September 25, 1851.

²⁹*Los Angeles Star*, September 23, 1851, in *Hayes' Constitutional Law*, 11 and 12.

³⁰*San Francisco Daily Herald*, October 28, 1851.

called attention to the unsatisfactory condition of relations that existed between the northern and southern counties. Among other things, he said:

A subject which has assumed a degree of importance not to be overlooked, by the Executive and Legislative branches of the State Government, is that arising from the operation of our system of taxation, in the alleged inequality with which it operates upon the different sections of the State. It is declared by citizens of the Southern counties, which are essentially agricultural and grazing, that under the present State organization and laws, they are overburdened with taxation for the support of the State Government, from which they derive little benefit, while the Northern mining counties, more favored in this respect, bear but a small proportion of the burdens of taxation. They say, also, that while the taxes they pay are double those paid by the mining counties, their representation in the Legislature is only one-third as numerous. From an examination of the taxes assessed upon real and personal property, and of those returned as delinquent, which will be seen by reference to the Report of the Comptroller of State, the six Southern and grazing counties, with a population of 6,367 souls, as taken from the census returns, have paid into the treasury for the fiscal year ending the first of July last, the sum of \$41,705.26, while the twelve mining counties, with a population of 119,917, have paid \$21,253.66. The latter have a representation in the Legislature of forty-four, while the former have but twelve. The amount of capitation tax assessed in the twelve mining counties is \$51,495.00, and the amount returned as delinquent \$47,915.00, while the amount assessed in the grazing counties is \$7,205.00, and the amount delinquent \$3,291.50, showing that the southern counties with a population of 6,367, pay a capitation tax of \$333.50 more than the twelve mining counties, which have a population of 119,917. It will be seen, also, by a reference to the same report, that the entire agricultural counties, with a population of 79,778, have paid into the Treasury during the last fiscal year \$246,247.71, while the mining counties with a population, as before stated, of 119,917, pay only \$21,253.66.³¹

The governor pointed out that the statement in the constitution that "all laws of a general nature shall have a uniform operation," and that "taxation shall be equal and uniform throughout the state," were true only in a legal sense, for the reason that the southern counties, which were mostly covered by grants and in the possession of individuals, paid a heavy tax upon every acre of land,

³¹*Journal of the Senate*, 185 , 12, 13.

which at best yielded but a moderate dividend on the valuation, while the mining counties, exceedingly prolific in the returns they made to their occupants, being almost entirely the property of the Federal Government, paid comparatively nothing into the state treasury. The results of this situation, he declared, were to force many citizens of the southern counties to alienate portions of their land and to sacrifice portions of their stock to meet what they considered an unjust burden. The worst thing of all was that the cords of amity between the sections were being broken. The constitution, he pointed out, prevented the legislature from remedying the evil. For this reason he recommended the calling of a convention to revise the constitution, at which time all inconveniences, of whatever nature, arising from the state charter, might be discussed, understood, and as far as possible obviated.³²

On February 3, a joint resolution was introduced in the Assembly by Mr. Graham from Solano County providing for the calling of a convention to revise the constitution.³³ It was referred to a special committee, which reported on February 11, Mr. Crabb of Stockton presenting the report for the majority. This report reviewed the history of the state since the territory came into possession of the United States, reiterated some of the facts of the governor's message, and, viewing the whole situation presented, approved heartily the complaints which came from the south. It was recommended that a convention be called "either to greatly reduce the limits of the state" or to give the legislature power of special legislation; the latter being somewhat equivocal and dangerous the former might be adopted as a *dernier ressort*.³⁴ The minority report from the committee, while seeking to explain some of the things of which the south complained, recognized that the people of the southern part of the state believed that the nature of the government caused the troubles alleged.³⁵

The question of the constitutional convention and state division were discussed outside the legislature. The *Daily Alta California* was bitter in its denunciations of the whole plan. It charged that such matters as were proposed were begun by slavery propagandists,

³²*Journal of the Senate*, 1852, 12, 13.

³³*Journal of the Assembly*, 1852, 134.

³⁴*Ibid.*, 166, 167, 168.

³⁵*Journal of the Assembly*, 1852, 170-174.

and were seconded by less influential men and miserable, speculating politicians who acted with them, and whose purpose from the beginning was to divide the state and secure a portion for slavery.³⁶ The assertion was made that the assembling of a convention to change the constitution would be the signal for opening upon the soil of California that hateful and baneful discussion of slavery that had so nearly severed the Union, and it was charged that the impracticable and deceitful scheme for the division of the state was mainly urged on by persons known to favor the establishment of slavery upon this coast.³⁷

This charge was repudiated by the press of the south. The *Los Angeles Star* of February 7 said:

We believe our representatives in the Legislature are fully instructed as to the wishes of their constituents. Any other than a territorial government for the South would not be asked for nor desired, and if this cannot be obtained at present, we can wait and hope for justice from future Legislatures. . . . It might have been expected, perhaps, that irrelevant questions would be brought into the discussion, when the Legislature took up the matter, and so we see that Slavery is to be lugged in, undoubtedly with no other view than to stave off Division. The resolutions of the Santa Barbara Convention, express at this time, as they did at the period of their promulgation, the views and feelings of Southern California, and if the Senators and Representatives from the Southern counties are guided by them in their measures to consummate a Division of the State, they will but second the views of their constituents.³⁸

Later this same paper said that the people of the south greatly resented the bringing of the slavery question into the discussion thus keeping the real issues out of their proper place.³⁹

The Assembly on March 2, passed the bill providing for the election of delegates to a constitutional convention by a vote of 51 to 7.⁴⁰ The bill came up in the Senate several times, but failed of passage in that body.⁴¹

³⁶*Daily Alta California*, February 7 and 20, 1852.

³⁷*Ibid.*, February 19, 1852.

³⁸*Los Angeles Star*, February 7, 1852, in *Daily Alta California*, February 29.

³⁹*Los Angeles Star*, February 14, 1852.

⁴⁰*Journal of the Assembly*, 1852, 258.

⁴¹*Journal of the Senate*, 1852, 352.

4. *In the legislature of 1853.*—On January 13, 1853, Mr. Myres of Placer County, introduced in the Assembly, a bill entitled "an act recommending to the electors to vote for or against calling a constitutional convention."⁴² The bill was referred to a special committee, was reported back to the Assembly, and on March 24, passed that body by a vote of 46 to 12.⁴³ In the proceedings and report of the special committee, there is little to indicate a connection of the bill with a purpose to divide the state, except that both measures were unanimously supported by members from the south. The report of the committee, however, pointed out defects in the constitution, and among other things made reference to the dissatisfaction existing in the south due to the disparity of taxation between the two sections.⁴⁴

In the Senate, where much discussion took place over the proposed measure, the purpose of those advocating a convention is more clearly brought out. On January 26, reports were received from the select committee to whom had been referred so much of the governor's message as referred to changes in the constitution. The majority report, submitted by Mr. Snyder and Mr. Lott, was against the calling of a constitutional convention. This report shows that it was generally understood that an effort to divide the state would be made should a convention be called. Division of the state at some future time was pointed to as a probability by the report, and was even held as desirable, but immediate division was opposed because, it was asserted, that in making a division it would be necessary for the southern part of the state to become a territory, where the population, free from taxation, would have no inducement to diminish their estates, as a consequence of which development would be slow in that section. Besides, the falling of a part of the territory back into pupilage would diminish the coast in the estimation of the world.⁴⁵

The first minority report, in discussing the disparity of taxation complained of, pointed out that the same inequality existed between the agricultural and the mining counties throughout the state, and that southern California did not suffer more than the other agricul-

⁴²*Journal of the Assembly*, 1852, 61.

⁴³*Ibid.*, 317.

⁴⁴*Journal of the Assembly*, 1853, Document 26, Appendix, p. 5.

⁴⁵*Journal of the Senate*, 1853, Appendix, Document 16, pp. 1-9.

tural regions. Figures were given showing that eight mining counties (Butte, Calaveras, Klamath, Placer, Shasta, Tuolumne, Trinity, and Yuba), with a population of 86,374 persons, paid taxes which amounted to \$1.00 per head for each inhabitant, and that fifteen agricultural counties (Colusi, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Marin, Monterey, Napa, San Francisco, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Santa Clara, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, Sonoma, Sutter, and Santa Cruz), with a population of 83,329 persons, paid taxes which amounted to \$2.64 per head. The agricultural counties mentioned, with a smaller population than the mining counties mentioned, paid \$1.65 more for each person than the mining counties. This was admitted by this section of the committee report to be unjust. But, at the same time, the report opposed a convention or state division, believing there were other remedies for the evils mentioned.⁴⁶ Both this report and that of the majority were laid upon the table.⁴⁷

A second minority report was presented by another section of the committee. About this report and the bill submitted with it, providing for a constitutional convention, the discussion of the Senate centered. The report was lengthy. It went into the history of the state and its constitution. Emphasis was put upon the inability of one state government to operate satisfactorily over so large an area as was included in California. Attention was called to the unjust operation of the revenue laws, the result of which was that a disproportionate share of the burden of the state government was borne by the commercial, agricultural, and grazing counties, while the mining counties enjoyed the controlling representation in the halls of the legislature. The report said:

Three revenue laws have been respectively passed at the three past sessions of the Legislature, and the result has proved that it is utterly impossible to prescribe any mode and description of taxation that will be practically "equal and uniform throughout the State."
. . . In fact, the revenue laws are as good, as just, as effective, as can be made under the existing constitution; and *no relief* can be looked for until the State is divided, and the mining counties and the agricultural counties are separated and placed under different governments.

⁴⁶*Journal of the Senate*, 1853, Appendix, Document 16, pp. 9-16.

⁴⁷*Journal of the Senate*, 1853, 77.

As an additional reason for division, the report held that a larger representation in Congress from the Pacific Coast was a practical necessity. Moreover, since in 1841 Congress had passed a law donating to every state of the Union five hundred thousand acres of the public lands, if so much was embraced within its borders, division would entitle the territory to more land. It was even suggested that three states were desirable.

It had been asserted that difficulties might arise over the slavery question. The report, on this point, took an emphatic position. It read:

The friends and advocates of a convention *are not now, and will not be at any time hereafter*, in favor of engrafting any new Constitution with a slavery clause. They are composed alike of northern, western, and southern men—men from every state in the Union, and all are opposed to the agitation and discussion of this element of dissension and discord, and are resolved to leave it out of the controversy altogether, despite the efforts of some of their opponents to foist it upon them. . . . The first voice for a division of the State came from the native Californians, and the first public meeting in its favor was held in the County of Los Angeles. . . . When the three [or two] new States, present their Republican Constitutions to Congress and demand admission into the Union who can believe that they will not be promptly admitted? Did not the compromise measures of 1850 finally and forever set at rest the subject of slavery? . . . *Let it be remembered* that the friends of a convention disclaim all sectional feeling, and will not at any stage of the measure advocate or oppose, or in anywise discuss the subject of slavery.⁴⁸

Public opinion, as indicated by the newspapers, seemed to be divided on the subject before the legislature. The *Daily Alta California*, which the preceding year had bitterly fought any suggestion of division, charging that the advocates were actuated by a desire to make slave territory in California, now admitted that there were good reasons for dividing the state, but insinuated that there were those who had sinister purposes, and said that until all was open the paper would make the most of the opposition to slavery it knew to exist in the minds of many.⁴⁹ The *Stockton Journal* of February 15 charged that a scheme had been devised to elect to the legislature men from the southern states or with southern proclivities and

⁴⁸*Journal of the Senate*, 1853, Appendix, Document 16, pp. 26-29.

⁴⁹*Daily Alta California*, January 28, May 27, 1853.

implied that there were men working evil designs.⁵⁰ But the *Sacramento Union* put these charges in their true light. The issue of February 2 said: "A division of the state into two or more states is a political necessity which will be recognized by all parties sooner or later."⁵¹ In a subsequent issue this paper said that it looked upon the effusions of those who professed to believe that there was any real danger of the introduction of slavery into any part of the state, as the production of a fevered fancy—of an imagination so diseased upon the subject of slavery as to be unable to view the subject through any other than a distorted medium.⁵² The religious press of the state was said to be generally opposed to division, fearing the possible introduction of slavery.⁵³

The discussion of the bill in the legislature gathered largely about constitutional questions and questions that had to do with alleged defects in that instrument. It was charged during the discussion that the conventionists had motives they dared not divulge,⁵⁴ but this was denied.⁵⁵ The slavery question did not come to the fore in the discussion. The day before the final vote on the convention question, Mr. Hubbs sought to get a measure before the Senate providing for a vote of the people directly upon the question of dividing California into three states, the south to be called "El Dorado," the middle "California," and the northern "Sacramento."

⁵⁰In *Daily Alta California*, February 18, 1853.

⁵¹*Sacramento Union*, February 2, 1853.

⁵²*Sacramento Union*, May 14, 1853.

⁵³*Ibid.*, May 4, 1853.

⁵⁴Efforts were made while the matter was under discussion to impugn the sincerity of the advocates of the measure by claiming that it was an effort to resuscitate the Whig party. It was claimed that a secret circular was sent by the Whig party leaders to their partisan papers of the state, in which it was suggested that changes be made in the state, that a convention be called, and the Whig party infused with new life through a movement for a convention, but all this to be done without disclosing the source from which the idea came. The authenticity of the alleged "Secret Circular" was later repudiated by the Whigs in the legislature, in a signed statement, in which they admitted sending out a circular letter, but denied that the one alleged was the one prepared by them. (*Sacramento Union*, May 20, 26, 1853.) Bancroft made the alleged purpose of the Whigs to resuscitate their party the explanation largely of the movement in this legislature for a convention. This seems a unreasonable contention, considering all the facts. It is interesting, however, to note that so far as the writer has been able to ascertain the party allegiance of members in this legislature the record shows that every Whig member who voted, voted for the convention.

⁵⁵*Sacramento Union*, February 28, 1853.

This proposal was rejected without much discussion. On April 6 the vote on the constitutional convention bill showed a vote of 16 ayes to 10 noes, and the bill was lost, through lacking the necessary two-thirds majority.⁵⁶

An analysis of the votes on the constitutional question in the two legislatures here discussed brings out the following facts: In 1852 all the votes in the Senate and the Assembly of members from the southern counties were cast in favor of a convention. Of the representatives from the northern counties who voted on the question in the Senate, seven voted for and eleven against a convention, and in the Assembly, forty voted for and seven against. The vote of 1853 shows a similar result. The southern representatives were all in favor of a convention; the northern delegates were divided. The northern delegates in the Senate cast fifteen votes for and nine against a convention, and in the Assembly thirty-one for and twelve against.

Comparing the votes of the mining and agricultural counties, using the classification made in the committee report at the time, it is seen that in 1853, in the Senate, the representatives of the mining counties cast two votes for and four against a convention, while those from the agricultural counties cast nine for and two against. Representatives of the mining counties in the Assembly divided the vote, giving seven for and ten against the plan for a convention, while the representatives from the agricultural counties voted twenty-three for and one against the proposal.⁵⁷ In other words, the demand for a convention came from the agricultural counties, both northern and southern.

III. THE MIDDLE PERIOD, 1854-1857

In the year 1854 state division did not become a vital issue in any form in the state legislature. But the subject continued to be agitated in the press of southern California,¹ and had an interest in other quarters. It will be remembered that during this year, and for a number of succeeding years, there was a strenuous con-

⁵⁶*Journal of the Senate*, 1853, 258, 295, 297, 301, 305.

⁵⁷*Journal of the Assembly*, 1852, 258; *Journal of the Senate*, 1853, 352; *Journal of the Assembly*, 1853, 317; *Journal of the Senate*, 1853, 305; also Journals of both houses for first two weeks of session for lists of members and the counties they represent.

¹*San Diego Herald*, June 10, 1854, in *Hayes' Constitutional Law*, 43.

flict within the Democratic party in California between Senator William M. Gwin and his followers on one hand and David C. Broderick and his followers on the other. By some in the East this struggle for leadership and the battle of diverse elements in a party were interpreted as a conflict of slavery and anti-slavery influences. Some, indeed, hoped this was the case, and that California might be divided and slavery introduced into a portion of it. It was even asserted that "southern California is peculiarly propitious to negro labor, and its inhabitants are very anxious that slaveholding should be introduced among them."² But this assertion was boldly denied in California by a northern paper, and the record of the state on the slavery question pointed out.³ Surprise was expressed by the *Sacramento Union* at the pertinacity with which the charge that there was a party in the state advocating a division of the state with the view of introducing slavery into southern California was iterated and reiterated in the state and out of it.⁴ The editor of the same paper declared that he had never "met a half dozen men known to be in favor of introducing slavery into any portion of the state," and asserted that if the proposal were submitted to a direct vote he was confident that three-fourths of the immigrants in California from slave states would vote against it.⁵

The state division question came squarely before the legislature of 1855. On February 27 Jefferson Hunt, of San Bernardino, introduced in the Assembly a bill for creating a new state out of California.⁶ This new state was to be called "Columbia," and was to embrace the territory included in the counties of Santa Cruz, Santa Clara, San Joaquin, Calaveras, Amador, Tuolumne, Stanislaus, Mariposa, Tulare, Monterey, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, Los Angeles, San Bernardino, and San Diego, together with the islands on the coast adjoining the counties included.⁷ The committee to whom the bill was referred reported on April 4, introducing as a substitute for the original bill an act to create three

²*Richmond Enquirer*, quoted by *Daily Statesman*, November 23, 1854.

³*Daily Statesman*, November 23, 1854.

⁴*Sacramento Union*, November 24, 1854.

⁵*Ibid.*, November 24, 1854.

⁶*Journal of Assembly*, 1855, 359.

⁷Guinn, *How California Escaped Division*, Historical Society of Southern California, *Annual Publications*, 1905, 226.

states out of the state of California.⁸ The first section of this act provided for enlarging the boundaries of California by making its eastern boundary a line running from the intersection of the forty-second degree of latitude with the one hundred and nineteenth of longitude, to the point where the Colorado river first touches California, and thence down this river to where Mexico joins California. Other sections provided for the division of the territory included within the enlarged bounds into a southern, a central, and a northern state, to be known respectively as "Colorado," "California," and "Shasta."⁹

The full discussion of the proposed division, which occurred on April 17, indicated the general sentiment of the legislature towards the proposal, and the arguments made on the occasion are of interest. Douglas, of San Joaquin County, contended that the state was too extensive for one government; the supreme court was too inaccessible because of the distance from the extremities of the state; the representation in Congress was too small for so large a territory. Ferrell, of San Diego, argued for the bill as an act of justice to the southern part of the state; he thought the south suffered because of its distance from the capital; the state was too large with its 1,000 miles of sea coast and 188,000 square miles of territory. It was contended by Hunt, of San Bernardino, that the God of nature and of the constitution had forbidden that the southern portion of the state should be trampled under foot; he knew the situation of the people because of his long residence in the state; their property was exhausted day by day by the burdens of taxation placed upon them. Buffum, of San Francisco, argued along the same lines. The people of the south had a right to feel aggrieved at the north; bills had been introduced in the legislature inapplicable to both the north and the south; the creator had made the northern and southern portions of the state dissimilar in physical and geographical character. On the other hand, it was thought by Burke, of Mariposa County, that the portion to be set off as the state of California would not contain inhabitants sufficient to enable it to become a state; and for that reason he thought the bill premature and fraught with danger to the peace of society.

⁸*Journal of the Assembly*, 1855, 613.

⁹*Hayes' Constitutional Law*, 47.

That there was any thought of their proposals and the slavery question becoming connected was disclaimed by Douglas and Hunt. Hunt declared that the negro question had not been so much as mooted in southern California for three years, and that two-thirds of the people were opposed to slavery. Flournoy, in reply to insinuations that slavery might become involved in the plan of division, said that Mariposa county was in favor of division, but that in the fight on the matter he had never heard the word "slavery," and that to put it in this discussion was unfair. He said that although he was a southern man, he would put a clause in the constitution against the introduction of slavery in the southern state. He hoped that the house would not be influenced by the introduction of the slavery question.¹⁰

In the debate, little direct opposition to the proposal was shown, but there were grave differences of opinion as to its constitutionality. On motion of Mr. Douglas, the bill was recommitted to the select committee of nine members, with instructions to report an address to the people of California on the subject.¹¹ In the address the committee incorporated the proposed act, and gave reasons for the proposal made. They set forth the capacities and resources of the several portions of the state, the impracticability of uniform legislation, the difficulty of distributing equal justice, the obstacles to the proper exercise of the executive functions, the impediments to harmonious action by the people, and the necessity of a larger representation in Congress from this coast in order to obtain political rights from the general government.¹² It was stated in the address that but one serious objection to the division had been urged, namely the revival in the Congress of the United States of the question of slavery in states and territories. To this objection it was answered that the people of the state had settled for themselves the question of slavery. The only part where slavery could exist if permitted was in the central portion, but here popular sentiment had settled the question forever.¹³ The *Daily Alta California*, which had previously opposed the division of the state, now simply advised waiting. As to slavery,

¹⁰*Sacramento Union*, April 18, 1855.

¹¹*Journal of the Assembly*, 1855, 693; *Sacramento Union*, April 18, 1855.

¹²*Hayes' Constitutional Law*. 47.

¹³*Ibid.*

it said the movement for division was now divested of sectional character, and that it was not probable that, in present light, anyone could suppose slavery would come into California.¹⁴

The legislative session of 1855 came to an end before the subject got fairly before the Senate. It was expected that it would get through both houses the next year, but the political situation in 1856, with the Democratic party divided, the Know Nothings in power, the contest for the senatorship, and other pressing political issues, left little place for the question of state division. On February 26, Cosby, of Trinity and Klamath Counties introduced in the Senate a bill to create three states out of the state of California. This was read a first and second time, and referred to the Judiciary Committee.¹⁵ The Judiciary Committee, having considered the bill, on March 22 recommended its passage, but it seems not to have received further favorable consideration.¹⁶

The legislature of 1857 passed a bill providing for the submission to the people of the question of calling a constitutional convention to revise the entire constitution. The reasons urged for the necessity of making changes in the constitution were in part the same as those urged for division. Matters connected with the judiciary and taxation were prominent among them. Had there been a convention, it seems very likely that the state division matter would have come up, and perhaps some urged the convention for this reason. The vote on the question of a convention was very close, but resulted in the defeat of the measure.¹⁷

IV. THE STRUGGLE ON THE EVE OF THE CIVIL WAR

1. *Proposed segregation of the southern counties.*—Resolutions were introduced in the legislature of 1858, on April 13, by Andrés Pico, Senator from the district embracing Los Angeles, San Bernardino, and San Diego Counties, which are of importance as being the prelude to the action taken by the legislature the next year. These resolutions were in effect a request to the legislature to pass an act setting off as a territory the part of California lying south of parallel 35 degrees and 45 minutes. The reasons given for the

¹⁴*Daily Alta California*, April 19, 1855.

¹⁵*Journal of the Senate*, 1856, 390.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, 571.

¹⁷*Journal of the Senate*, 1857, 36, 37, 520; *Hayes' Constitutional Law*, 54.

request were the difference in climate, soil, and productions of the south and the north, the dissimilarity of the people in language, manners, customs, and interests, and the separateness of the two sections made by geographical conditions.¹ The resolutions were withdrawn by the friends of the measure because it was thought that their discussion would retard the business of the session, which was near its close.²

It was no surprise when, on February 5, 1859, Don Andrés Pico introduced resolutions in the Assembly looking toward action for the segregation of the southern part of the state from the northern part and the erecting of the segregated portion into a territory.³ The preamble to the resolutions stated reasons for the proposed division. The boundaries of the state, it was urged, enclosed an area too large and diversified for one state. Because uniform legislation was unjust and ruinous to the south, it was demanded that the untoward union be dissolved. The district which it was proposed to leave out of California and organize as the Territory of Colorado, with the consent of the Congress of the United States, was all that part of the state comprised in the counties of San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Los Angeles, San Diego, and San Bernardino, including the islands lying opposite to the adjacent coast. Provision was made for adjustment with California, and the Congress of the United States was asked to give immediate organization.⁴

At the request of Mr. Pico this matter was referred to a special committee,⁵ which submitted its reports on March 2. The majority report said:

They believe that there exist good and valid reasons why the inhabitants of the said territory should, or may, desire such separation, and, also, that it is expedient that the State should consent thereto, under the conditions, restrictions, and qualifications, provided in the accompanying bill, which they have instructed their Chairman to introduce in lieu of, and as a substitute for, the afore-said resolutions. But while they fully endorse the expediency of the measure, they wish to leave the question of its constitutionality an open one, without expressing an opinion on the subject.⁶

¹*Journal of the Assembly*, 1858, 564, 565.

²*Sacramento Union*, February 8, 1859.

³*Ibid.*, February 5, 1859; *Journal of the Assembly*, 1859, 230.

⁴*Los Angeles Star*, February 19, 1859, in *Hayes' Constitutional Law*, 58.

⁵*Journal of the Assembly*, 1859, 230.

⁶*Ibid.*, 1859, 341, 342.

A minority of the committee submitted a report in which it was held that the proposed separation could not take place except by the prescribed mode of amending the constitution, or by the action of a constitutional convention, in both of which cases the people of all the state would have to pass upon the changes proposed. By this report, the indefinite postponement of the whole matter was recommended.⁷

The proposed Act, which was submitted with the report of the majority of the special committee, described the desired boundaries of the new territory of Colorado as

all of that part, or portion of the present territory of this State [California], lying all south of a line drawn eastward from the west boundary of the State along the sixth standard of parallel south of the Mount Diablo meridian, east to the summit of the Coast Range; thence southerly, following said summit to the seventh standard parallel; thence due east, on said standard, parallel to its intersection with the northwest boundary of Los Angeles county; thence northeast along said boundary, to the eastern boundary of the State, including the counties of San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Los Angeles, San Diego, San Bernardino, and a part of Buena Vista.

The Act directed the governor in his proclamation for the next general election to instruct the voters in the territory proposed to be segregated to vote for or against such segregation, and provided that if two-thirds of the voters residing therein and voting thereon should vote for the proposed changes, the division should take place, subject to the consent of Congress. Provisions were made for adjustments with California should the proposed division carry.⁸

Evidence as to the motives of those favoring this measure is not abundant, except as stated by the committee report of March 2. But it will be seen that they are the reasons which had consistently and repeatedly been given; and it does not seem necessary to look for others. A noted writer, however, makes the assertion that, "The Lecomptonites, taking advantage of the fact that the native Californians had always been opposed to being taxed for the support of a state government, that they complained of the inequality

⁷*Ibid.*, 350-352.

⁸*Statutes of California*, 1859, 310, 311.

of taxes as between agriculturists and miners, and maintained their right to carry slaves into any territory, had fixed upon this means of consummating their purpose of bringing slave property to the Pacific Coast."⁹ A newspaper of the time wrote harsh words about pestilential politicians and political fortune hunters, who had easily imposed upon the weakness of the southern native citizens, whose political habits prior to the establishment of an American state on these shores was decidedly revolutionary.¹⁰

On the other hand, it is to be noted that in the discussions in the legislature there was much doubt as to the constitutionality of the measure, though there was no serious difference as to the desirability of the separation, and the south's sincere desire in reference to it.¹¹ It was pointed out at the time that some weight should be given to the ability and character of Mr. Pico as a pledge that no personal or sinister motive was back of the proposal.¹² There seemed to be sincere advocacy of the measure in the southern part of the state, where the method being followed was advocated as a proper one for a negotiation between the federal and state governments in looking toward the harmonious accomplishment of a result which the people of the south had so long desired.¹³ It seems fair to give some consideration to the words of a writer in the *Sacramento Union*, who, answering charges that had been made, pointed out how long and persistently the inhabitants of the south had sought division on legitimate grounds, and who said, "Why attribute it to ambitious plotting of political fortune hunters? . . . The members from the south in the convention to form a state constitution for California, desired to be left out, but as they were informed that great advantages would result to those counties, they willingly submitted. A ten years experience has convinced them that they were deceived."¹⁴ Those interested in division reiterated the contentions that had been made since the constitutional convention, declaring over again that these same reasons were still actuating them, and contending

⁹Bancroft, *History of California*, VII, 254, 255.

¹⁰*Sacramento Union*, February 5, 1859.

¹¹*Ibid.*, February 16, March 16, 1859.

¹²*Southern Vineyard*, February 18, 1859, in *Hayes' Constitutional Law*, 59.

¹³*Ibid.*, April 22, 1859.

¹⁴*Sacramento Union*, February 8, 1859.

that the present effort was but a part of the continued movement to get justice for the south.¹⁵

On March 25, the Assembly by a vote of 33 ayes to 25 noes passed the Act.¹⁶ It passed the Senate on April 14, by a vote of 15 ayes to 12 noes,¹⁷ and was approved by the governor April 19.¹⁸ All of the delegates from southern California, in the territory affected by the proposed segregation, voted for the bill. The legislators from the northern counties divided, in the Senate, eleven voting for and twelve against, and in the Assembly, 27 for and 24 against the Act.¹⁹

The election on the above measure took place at the appointed time. The returns from the election showed the following result:

	<i>For.</i>	<i>Against.</i>
Los Angeles	1407	441
San Bernardino	421	29
San Diego	207	24
Santa Barbara	395	51
San Luis Obispo.....	10	283
Tulare	17	...
	<hr/> 2457	<hr/> 828

These figures show that the measure carried by a good vote beyond the necessary two-thirds required.²⁰

While the above measure was under consideration in the legislature, a bill was introduced in the Assembly on February 17, entitled "an Act to authorize the citizens of the state of California residing north of the fortieth degree of north latitude to withdraw from the state of California and organize a separate government." The bill was referred to the committee on Colorado territory.²¹ The committee gave consideration to the bill, and made report, recommending that the matter be referred to the delegations included within the limits of the territory which it was proposed to with-

¹⁵*Los Angeles Star*, February 19, 1859.

¹⁶*Journal of the Assembly*, 1859, 474.

¹⁷*Journal of the Senate*, 1859, 744.

¹⁸*Statutes of California*, 1859, 310, 311.

¹⁹*Journal of the Senate*, 1859, 744; *Journal of the Assembly*, 1859, 474.

²⁰*Sacramento Union*, September 29, 1859.

²¹*Sacramento Union*, February 18, 1859.

draw, to-wit: Siskiyou, Del Norte, Klamath, Humboldt, Trinity, Shasta, Plumas, and Tehama.²² Nothing further came of it. It was felt at the time that the bill was proposed by northern members to offset or checkmate the demand of the southern delegates for a separate government for their constituents.²³ The *Sacramento Union* considered it a sly satire on the southern movement, which its movers did not expect or desire to become a law²⁴—like a bill later introduced to form a state below Tehachapi called "South Cafeteria."

2 *Final events of the decade.*—On January 11, 1860, the legislature in joint session elected the governor, Milton S. Latham, a native of Ohio, United States Senator to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Senator David C. Broderick.²⁵ On January 12 the senator-elect sent a communication to the legislature relative to the six southern counties which had voted in favor of segregation. The message stated that he had, in compliance with the Act authorizing the six southern counties to vote upon the question of separation from the balance of the state, transmitted to the president of the United States a certified copy thereof, a statement of the vote, and also a paper embodying his own views on the question. He then said: "As the people of the state are deeply interested in any action Congress may take in the matter, and as I may soon be required, as a Senator, to urge or oppose, the formation of a new government for these counties, I think it proper to send herewith a copy of the paper referred to."

In the message to the president, Latham reviewed the action taken by the legislature and the results of the election under the legislative Act. He then declared the origin of this Act,

to be found in the dissatisfaction of the mass of people, in the southern counties of this state, with the expenses of a State Government. They are an agricultural people, thinly scattered over a large extent of country. They complain that the taxes upon their land and cattle are ruinous—entirely disproportioned to the taxes collected in the mining regions; that the policy of the State, hitherto, having been to exempt mining claims from taxation, and the mining population being migratory in its character, and hence con-

²²*Hayes' Constitutional Law*, 57.

²³*Ibid.*

²⁴*Sacramento Union*, February 18, 1859.

²⁵*Journal of the Assembly*, 1860, 118-123.

tributing but little to the State revenue in proportion to their population, they are unjustly burdened; and that there is no remedy, save in a separation from the other portion of the State. In short, that the union of southern and northern California is unnatural.

It is well known that at the time of the formation of our State Constitution, the people of Southern California preferred a territorial to a State form of government. But, yielding their preference, they made common cause with their brethren of the north, in the adoption of our present constitution though from that time forward they seem to have regretted the step.

The argument presented by Latham favored the division, and contended that the Act of the legislature was valid, though it had never been submitted to the people of the whole state. He held that Article 4, Section 3 of the Federal Constitution contained all the requirements for a division of the state. This being true, if the people in a severed portion preferred to be organized under a territorial government, nothing in the Constitution prevented. The communication of the governor was referred to the committee on Federal Relations.²⁶ On January 14, Rogers, of San Francisco, introduced in the Assembly a concurrent resolution relating to the separation of the southern counties. It instructed the Senators and Representatives of the state and people in Congress to oppose the execution of the Act of segregation.²⁷ This resolution was also referred to the committee on Federal Relations.²⁸

Majority and minority reports were received from the committee on Federal Relations on January 26.²⁹ The majority report asserted its agreement with Governor Latham's contention that "the act of the California legislature is valid," and that the Federal Constitution, which is superior to those of individual states, does not require any action by the people in case of a relinquishment of a part of a territory by a state to the Federal government. The report then took up the resolution introduced by Rogers, which it declared to be a "concurrent resolution of the legislature, brought forward and proposed without any demonstration in its favor on the part of the people,—to compel by instructions the Senators and Representatives of the state and people in Congress, to oppose the

²⁶*Journal of the Assembly*, 1860, 125-132.

²⁷*Ibid.*, 155.

²⁸*Ibid.*

²⁹*Ibid.*, 228.

execution of their deliberate and solemn act of legislation, incorporated in the statutes of this state." The report continues:

Your committee, convinced of the impropriety of this mode of defeating the objects of a law, and impressed with the conviction that the best interests not only of the inhabitants of the Territory under consideration, but the whole people of California, as well as the entire community of the Pacific coast of the United States, will be promoted by the separation and the organization of a greater number of States along its shores than was contemplated in one thousand eight hundred and forty nine, could but view the adoption of the resolution with unfeigned regret.

The minority report was an argument against the legality and constitutionality of the proposed mode of separation. It contended that the statement in the constitution that, "all political powers are inherent in the people—government is instituted for the protection, security, and benefit of the people," would not be worth a farthing if it could be destroyed by Congress in the manner proposed, whenever a legislature could be found complaisant enough to sanction such a proceeding. It was contended, further, that whenever a division should be made, it would have to be done in the same way as the constitution was adopted—by all concerned—and in a manner that gives them a voice in a way a mere enactment does not. There is also expressed the fear that in the present state of public feeling, growing out of the Kansas trouble, there would be opened another field to be fought over. The minority, therefore, would prevent the separation on the grounds of its illegality and of public policy.³⁰

On March 1 arose the question of approving or rejecting the majority report of the committee on Federal Relations, and it was approved by a vote of 37 ayes to 26 noes.³¹ Immediately following this action, a bill was introduced to repeal the act providing for a vote on segregation passed by the last legislature,³² but this measure did not come to a vote.

In the Senate, a committee took up the questions involved in the governor's recommendation, and reported favorably a bill pro-

³⁰*Journal of the Assembly*, 1860, 228-233.

³¹*Journal of the Assembly*, 1860, 412-413.

³²*Ibid.*, 460.

viding for the segregation of the southern counties in accordance with their vote.³³ But there seems to have been no further action taken. The country was now facing the issues which culminated in the war between the states. Secession and approaching civil conflict left no place for the question of state division, and so the matter rested until after the Civil War and Reconstruction.

V. THE STATE DIVISION MOVEMENT AND THE SLAVERY PROPAGANDA

As has already been intimated, writers on California history quite generally have attributed the movement to divide the state, in the decade under discussion, to the influence of slavery and slavery propagandists, whose purpose from the beginning was to secure a part of California for slavery. Royce, in his *California*, asserts that William M. Gwin, with other southerners in the constitutional convention, was working a deep-laid scheme to effect a division of California, the purpose being to secure a part of it for the South's institution.¹ Mr. J. M. Guinn, on the same point, is quite definite. He says:

The scheme of Gwin and his southern associates was to make the Rocky mountains the eastern boundary. This would create a state with an area of about four hundred thousand square miles. They reasoned that when the admission of the state came before Congress, the southern members would oppose the admission of so large an area under a free state constitution and that ultimately a compromise might be effected. California would be split in two from east to west, the old dividing line, the parallel of 36° 30', would be established and Southern California come into the Union as a slave state.²

Other writers make similar statements as to the purposes of supposed slavery advocates in that convention.³ The writers then carry their assertions concerning the purposes of alleged slavery advocates to the question of state division after admission. Guinn says:

³³*Journal of the Senate*, 1860, 415.

¹Pp. 261-269.

²Guinn, J. M. A., *History of California, and an Extended History of Its Southern Coast Counties*, I, pp. 114.

³See Fitch, *How California Came Into the Union* (in pamphlets on California, 26:5); Baneroft, *History of California*, VI. pp. 283; Hunt, *Genesis of California's First Constitution*, in *Johns Hopkins University Studies*, V, 13.

The admission of California into the Union as a free state did not, in the opinion of the ultra pro-slavery faction, preclude the possibility of securing a part of its territory for the "peculiar institution" of the south. The question of state division which had come up in the constitutional convention was again agitated. The advocates of division hoped to cut off from the southern part, territory enough for a new state. The ostensible purpose of division was kept concealed. The plea of unjust taxation was made prominent. The native Californians who under Mexican rule paid no taxes on their land were given to understand that they were bearing an undue proportion of the cost of government, while the mining counties, paying less tax, had the greater representation. The native Californians were opposed to slavery, an open advocacy of the real purpose would defeat the division scheme.⁴

Tuthill, in his *History of California*, makes the statement: "As early as 1852, the Chivalry had unsuccessfully attempted a convention with the secret purpose of dividing the State and erecting the southern half into Slave Territory."⁵ A recent article says, "The Gwin party hoped to divide California into two states and hand the southern over to slavery";⁶ while another writer has asserted that "From the adoption of the state constitution in 1849 to 1861, the southern wing of that party [the Democratic] did everything in their power to divide the State, their purpose being to make a Slave State out of the southern portion of it."⁷

A study of the history of the state division movement, however, does not indicate that the pro-slavery motive had the preponderating influence in the movement which these writers have attributed to it. In fact, it shows that there is small basis for their assertions. In the first place, their statements concerning the purposes of slavery advocates in the constitutional convention are incorrect. A recent writer, by an analysis of the votes taken in the constitutional convention on the crucial question of the eastern boundary, has shown conclusively the baselessness of the repeated assertions concerning an alignment of northern and southern men, and of slavery and anti-slavery forces, with reference to the boundary question, and has demonstrated that the repeated charges that southerners were manipulating and working in that convention

⁴Guinn, *A History of California, and an Extended History of Its Southern Coast Counties*, I, 204.

⁵P. 576.

⁶Article on "California," *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 11th Edition.

⁷Carr, *Pioneer Days in California*, 346.

to secure conditions for the further extension of slavery cannot be deduced from a study of the debates and votes of the convention.⁸ But there was a purpose, on the part of some in that convention, to secure division. This, however, has been shown to have had its cause in the unalloyed desire of the native Californians to be placed under a territorial form of government, in order that they might avoid being united with a people they did not understand, and whose domination they feared.⁹

As to the movement carried on through the decade to divide the state, it must be said that the writers referred to, in assigning causes for it, seem to have had their views determined too much by reasoning from what they supposed was a deep-laid plan of slavery propagandists in the constitutional convention. During the decade of the agitation for division, charges were made that there was back of the movement the purpose to make slave territory out of a part of California. But these were denied, in several instances by the very newspapers which had made them, and beyond inferences, charges, and innuendo, the evidence to support the claim that slavery conspiracy was fundamental in the division movement is scant. To hold, as one writer does,¹⁰ that the ostensible purpose was *kept concealed through a decade*, is to ask much of prejudice and credulity. On the other hand, the history of the movement shows that during the years under discussion the facts of differences of country and people of the northern and southern parts of the state, the feeling that injustice was done to a section and a class, the desire of the native Californians for a separate territorial government, the developing life of the western frontier seeking a larger representation in Congress, and the continued problem of adjustment of a great and diverse population, were factors manifesting themselves in clear and definite form. Now and then slavery discussion was an incident in the movement, but at no time does the slavery propaganda appear as a determining factor. It is truer, on the basis of the evidence to say that slavery discussion was occasionally injected into the movement to divide the state than to say that the division movement grew out of the slavery propaganda.

⁸Goodwin, "The Eastern Boundary of California in the Constitutional Convention," in *THE QUARTERLY*, XVI, 254, 255.

⁹See above, pp. 104-105.

¹⁰See above, p. 138.

THE LOUISIANA-TEXAS FRONTIER

III

ISAAC JOSLIN COX

PART II—THE AMERICAN OCCUPATION OF THE LOUISIANA-TEXAS FRONTIER—(*Continued.*)

III. EXPLORING EXPEDITIONS OF THE TEXAS FRONTIER

Jefferson had planned to explore Louisiana, or at least as much of it as was necessary to traverse in pursuing a direct route to the Pacific, long before he gained possession of the territory. Meriwether Lewis was already making preparations for his memorable journey, when his chief learned of the unexpected acquisition. He was thus in a position to turn his project to very practical account and be the first to acquire the definite information that would assist the President in determining just what he had bought from France. For this reason his undertaking becomes the premier event in a new epoch of Far Western exploration, and incidentally a prominent factor in the attempt to extend the Louisiana-Texas frontier to the Rio Grande. In the frontier area between that river and the Mississippi Lewis and Clark emphasize the northern route by way of the Missouri and Platte, which has Santa Fé as its objective point. Its consideration, then, belongs to another phase of our subject.¹

After Jefferson knew of the acquisition of Louisiana, he perceived that the event gave a new impulse and purpose to his exploring plan. That work must be pursued on a more extensive scale to overcome the serious handicap of the United States in the inevitable territorial controversy with Spain. This will explain his statement in his letter of August 11, 1803, to Isaac Briggs, a government surveyor, that: "Congress would probably authorize the exploration of the principal streams of the Mississippi and Missouri," to determine those "given points in the highlands enclosing those rivers" that "constitute the exterior boundary of the acquisi-

¹Consult Cox, *Early Exploration of Louisiana*, Ch. II and III, *passim*.

tion."² This exploration formed an important phase of the administration's policy in taking possession of Louisiana and aroused corresponding fears and efforts to combat it on the part of Spanish officials.

Jefferson's plan for the exploration of Louisiana, and the distinction which he wished to preserve between the expedition of Lewis and Clark and those he now had in mind, is best shown in his letter of November 16, 1803, to Meriwether Lewis:

The object of your mission is single, the direct water communication from sea to sea formed by the bed of the Missouri, and perhaps the Oregon. I have proposed in conversation, and it seems generally assented to, that Congress appropriate ten to twelve thousand dollars for exploring the principle waters of the Mississippi and Missouri. In that case I should send a party up the Red River to its head, then to cross over to the head of the Arkansas and come down that. A second party for the Panis and Padouca, and a third, perhaps, for the Morsigona and St. Peters. This [exploration] will be attempted distinctly from your mission, which we consider of major importance and therefore not to be delayed or hazarded by any episodes whatever.³

In a letter to Dunbar he elaborated the details of his plan. The surveyor general for the district north of the Ohio was to be authorized to explore the upper Mississippi. Upon obtaining the probable authorization of Congress he proposed to send an expedition up the Panis and down the Padoucas, exploring the entire course of both rivers, and another up the Arkansas and the Red. Each party was to take careful astronomical observations at the source of each river explored and from the data thus secured it would be possible to construct a skeleton map of Louisiana, which in contour and main streams would be perfectly correct, and whose details could be filled in at leisure. For details north of the Missouri, upon which stream Lewis and Clark were about to embark, he expected to depend upon British fur traders and explorers.⁴

The result of Jefferson's quiet personal work among the members

²*Jefferson Papers*, Ser. 1, Vol. 9, No. 121.

³*Jefferson's Works* (Memorial Edition), X, 431 *et seq.* Jeffrey's *American Atlas* (London), 1776, shows these four rivers with somewhat modified spelling. Their equivalents are as follows: "Panis"—Platte; "Morsigona" (also Moingona)—Des Moines; "Padouca" (also "Padoucas" and misprinted "Radoncas")—Kansas; "St. Peters"—Minnesota.

⁴Washington, *Writings of Jefferson*, IV, 539.

of the Eighth Congress appeared in a report dated March 8, 1804, from the Committee on Commerce and Manufactures. After hazarding a surmise that the new territory extended to the Pacific, the report touched upon previous explorations of the Mississippi and of the Gulf Coast by Hutchins and Ellicott, mentioned the plans for penetrating the upper Mississippi and Missouri, and closed by advocating the Red and the Arkansas as affording the next most favorable field for exploration. For this purpose the services of private individuals should be utilized, wherever possible, and in addition an appropriation should be given the President to supplement such efforts.⁵

A few days later Jefferson, as above indicated, wrote Dunbar of his plan and asked him to direct the expedition up the Red and Arkansas, in case Congress should authorize the required appropriation. The preparations for the expedition were to be made at New Orleans and Natchez, and the collector of customs at the former place would honor all drafts for this purpose. The instructions to the leader were to be similar to those issued to Lewis and Clark, with such additional ones as Dunbar should think necessary to add. "Still, this is a matter of speculation," added the President, warningly, for Congress was hastening matters to bring its session to a close, "and in that case all I have said will be as if I had not said it." The action of this legislative body, owing to opposition in the Senate, was but partially favorable, for its hurried appropriation was only \$3,000, barely sufficient for one party. This Jefferson determined to send upon the more interesting of his two proposed explorations; and without waiting for Dunbar's acceptance, he again wrote, asking him to superintend the preparations for the expedition up the Red and Arkansas, and to select its leader. For this position he suggested a Mr. Walker, of Mississippi, or a Mr. Gillespie, of North Carolina, both of whom had served with Ellicott. He mentioned the fact that a George Hunter, of Philadelphia, would accompany the expedition. Dr. Hunter's "fort," the President wrote, "is chemistry, and in the practical part of that science he is supposed to have no equal in the United States." He warned Dunbar that Hunter might attempt to turn the expedition into a prospecting tour for gold and silver mines,

⁵*Annals 8th Cong., 1st Sess., 1124-26.*

and that such an incidental object must not be allowed to defeat the main purpose of the expedition.⁶

In his replies of May 15th and June 1st, Dunbar tempered his expression of gratification over the fact that Congress had authorized the expedition by wishing that that body had displayed more liberality. The House committee in its report had seemed to take it for granted that scientific men would be led by patriotism to undertake their work of exploration. While many might be influenced by such a motive, yet in the case of a talented man of limited means it would be at the expense of precious time; and when a great empire spoke of compensation it should be adequate to the importance of the task. It would be difficult to find the proper man in the vicinity of Natchez. Of the two men mentioned by Jefferson, Gillespie was the better educated, while Walker, then serving in the Spanish army, possessed the greater natural talent; but neither had any particular qualification for the work aside from a knowledge of surveying. He believed they must choose a man possessing the requisite geographical knowledge and consider themselves fortunate if he knew anything of natural history, botany, or mineralogy. If a man of "only moderate talents" was needed, he suggested that Dr. Hunter should command the expedition.⁷

The instructions to Dunbar as director of the expedition accompanied the President's letter of April 13, 1804. In general they followed closely those previously issued to Meriwether Lewis. From Natchez, the point of departure, the leader was to conduct the party to the remotest source of the Red River, and thence to the highlands dividing the waters of this stream from those of the Bravo (Rio Grande) and the Pacific. After making a careful exploration of these highlands, he was to descend the Arkansas, noting upon this river, as upon the former, the important natural features and taking numerous astronomical observations. With regard to the Indians, he should tell them, in accordance with the later message borne by Lewis, that now the Spaniards had agreed to withdraw all their troops "from the Mississippi and Missouri and from all countries watered by any rivers running into them," thus emphasizing the Jeffersonian idea of the extent of Louisiana. In

⁶*Jefferson Papers*, Ser. 1, Vol. 10, No. 60.

⁷*Ibid.*, Ser. 2, Vol. 28, Nos. 62 and 63.

view of the prospective withdrawal of these garrisons and the change in allegiance of any subjects residing upon these tributaries, they were to emphasize the probable advantage of trade relations with the United States and to arrange for the establishment of trading posts. In connection with his suggestions upon relations with "those people," he warns the leader of the party not to persevere in his exploration, if threatened by a superior force, "authorized or not authorized by a nation." The lives of the members of the expedition are too valuable to be exposed to probable destruction, and with the loss of the party would follow the loss of all results from the expedition. The fact that this warning, as in the case of the instructions to Lewis, follows the paragraphs devoted to the Indians, seems to imply that the President anticipated the use of this alternative only as a result of savage opposition. Yet, as a matter of fact, it was employed only in yielding to the Spaniards and was probably an expedient of Jeffersonian diplomacy to avoid direct mention of their possible opposition.

It so chanced that Stephen Minor, the last Spanish governor of the Natchez district, had remained in that region to keep watch upon the movements of the Americans and report to the Spanish authorities. Dunbar was on excellent terms with him and consulted him in regard to the President's plan for exploring the Red River. Minor told him that such an enterprise ought not to be undertaken before the limits of Louisiana were positively fixed. To send a party of soldiers to the sources of rivers in the disputed territory would be an insult to Spain and would cause that power to retaliate by forcing it to return. Minor thought that by this argument he had convinced Dunbar, but he did not feel any too confident of this result. He therefore lost no time in communicating his information to Casa Calvo at New Orleans, who quickly disseminated it amongst the interested Spanish authorities.⁸

Salcedo had already learned of the Lewis and Clark expedition some three months before Casa Calvo's communication telling of Jefferson's Red River project. This reiterated the previous admonitions to preserve "the vast dominions of His Majesty" by the immediate arrest of those who should engage in such work and, as before, Salcedo reported the warning to the viceroy, Itur-

⁸Casa Calvo to Cevallos, June 21, 1804. *Legajo 5542, Estado, Archivo Historico Nacional, Madrid.*

rigaray. The latter suggested that Casa Calvo ought to have taken up the matter with Casa Yrujo, the minister, as the person best prepared to discuss these matters, and so at once cut off all possibility of danger. Salcedo stated that as in the previous case he had taken all possible precautions to anticipate the views of the American government, but for some reason his reports were not forwarded to Madrid and this later caused the state officials great concern. However, Cevallos learned of Minor's report to Casa Calvo and immediately suggested to the War Department the necessity of sending a party of soldiers to restrain any such efforts. American hunters must not be allowed to range over Spanish territory under pretext of scientific exploration.⁹

In addition to his negative work in attempting to break up Jefferson's exploring expeditions, Casa Calvo was also attempting in a positive way to justify his position as boundary commissioner by acquiring some definite information to guide him in his task. In this he was likely to encounter some opposition from his fellow officials unless he exercised care in selecting his agents, for upon receiving notice of this appointment Salcedo wrote to the Governor of Texas that no American should be permitted to approach its frontier or in any way be allowed to mark alone the limits of Louisiana. Two months later José Joaquín Ugarte, who commanded on the Texas frontier, dutifully wrote the governor, Lieutenant Colonel Juan Bautista Elguezábal, that in accordance with instructions, he should permit no Anglo-Americans to approach Spanish territory for fear they might mark the boundary without regard to Spanish interests.¹⁰

In July Casa Calvo wrote Salcedo that he desired to learn more of the rivers near the limits of Louisiana and for this purpose was sending Juan Minor, the brother of Stephen, to make a map of the region. He requested that John Walker, who had previously served on the Ellicott Commission, should assist in this work.¹¹ Three days later, July 6, 1804, he issued the necessary passport, empowering Minor to visit Bahía and San Antonio upon necessary royal

⁹Minute of November 29, 1806, *Ibid.*; N. Salcedo to Iturrigaray, May 3, 1804; *Provincias Internas*, Vol. 200.

¹⁰Salcedo to Elguezábal, May 3, 1804; Ugarte to Elguezábal, MSS., *Bexar Archives*.

¹¹Casa Calvo to N. Salcedo, July 3, 1804. *Legajo No. 185, Papeles procedentes de les Isla de Cuba, Archivo General de Indias, Seville.*

business, of which the character was not disclosed.¹² This, however, was given in a letter of instructions sent by Salcedo to Governor Elguezabal. This letter stated that Minor had been commissioned by Casa Calvo to pass from Natchitoches to mark the boundary line of Louisiana, after a due examination of the rivers and of the coast. Salcedo instructed the governor, upon the appearance of Minor, to examine closely his commission, orders, and instructions; to have him state clearly what he had thus far done; and to show the means for carrying his plans into execution. He was especially to declare his citizenship; and if he claimed to be a subject of the King, he was to be furnished a guard to Chihuahua; if of the United States, he was not to be permitted to enter the province.

In his reply to the general commandant, the governor echoed his superior's suspicions regarding Minor and promised to obey his injunctions. On September 4th Ugarte at Nacogdoches reported to Elguezabal that he was watching closely the movements of Minor. On September 13th Minor presented himself at Nacogdoches, but he claimed that he had merely verbal instructions to pass from that place to the Trinity, to descend this river and explore the neighboring creeks and bays, and make a map for Casa Calvo. Later, the Governor of Texas advised Ugarte to detain him at Nacogdoches to await Salcedo's pleasure. On the 21st of the following November the governor again informed Salcedo that Juan Minor and two others, one of whom was Hugo Coyle, an Irish surveyor, had presented written petitions asking to be admitted into Texas, but that he had directed Minor to await Salcedo's determination. Evidently it was well that he did so, for he later received the order of Salcedo, dated October 22, withdrawing the permission to survey the boundary given to Minor on the 11th of the preceding August.¹³ The attitude of Salcedo from the very first emphasized the fact that the Texas officials were jealous of Casa Calvo and were going as far as they dared in thwarting his plans.

Meanwhile, during the month of May, 1804, Dr. George Hunter, acting under the instructions of the Secretary of War, had busied himself in Philadelphia in the purchase of provisions, Indian pres-

¹²Dated at New Orleans, July 6, 1804. *Bexar Archives*.

¹³*Ibid.*, correspondence of Salcedo, Elguezabal, and Ugarte, August-December, 1804.

ents, medicines, and instruments for the proposed expedition up the Red River. His request to Casa Yrujo for a passport met with a curt refusal, for the Spanish minister believed that his purpose was to penetrate to New Mexico.¹⁴ Nothing deterred, on the 27th of May the doctor and his son set out on horseback for the overland journey to Pittsburg. After eight days they arrived at the latter place, where, with better success than Lewis the previous year, they spent only two weeks in superintending the construction of a flat-bottomed boat to convey themselves and stores to Natchez. The details of their journey to the latter town furnish a most interesting picture of pioneer travel upon the Ohio and Mississippi, but are not directly connected with our theme, and so may be omitted. The doctor records, "with a feeling of relief," that, on the 24th day of July, they made fast to the shore at Natchez.

Although Hunter had consumed nearly two months on the trip from Philadelphia, he speedily learned from Mr. Dunbar that no preparations had been made for the expedition. Possibly Minor's protest may account for this inactivity. Lieutenant Colonel Constant Freeman, the commandant of the garrison at New Orleans, was to furnish the boat and military escort, but had deferred all measures until Hunter's arrival. Dunbar suggested that the doctor should proceed with his boat to New Orleans, and if no better one could be procured, have some alterations made in it, buy the necessary stores, and return as soon as possible with the military escort. Accordingly Hunter was obliged to spend the next two months in the trip to New Orleans and return, and in repairing his boat. This craft was constructed for use on a large river, but was the only one procurable and must perforce serve for the navigation of the smaller streams that they planned to explore. With a far from efficient crew, composed of a sergeant and twelve enlisted men from the New Orleans garrison, and with his makeshift boat, Hunter, in the latter part of September, again reached the proposed starting point of the expedition, St. Catherine's Landing, just below Natchez. In general, one gains the impression from the pages of the doctor's journal that only a very moderate degree of alacrity was displayed in following out the details of the President's plan.

During Hunter's stay in New Orleans there had been an entire

¹⁴Cf. Cox, *loc cit.*, Note 22; also *Legajo* 5542, *Estado, Archivo Historico Nacional*, Madrid.

change in the plan itself. On the 17th of July Jefferson wrote Dunbar that on account of the shifting of a part of the Osage Indians to the Arkansas two years before, the expedition was to be postponed until the following spring. The significance of this Indian movement had but just been explained to the President by Pierre Chouteau, then on a visit to Washington with White Hairs, the noted Osage chief, and some of his companions. Chouteau was to visit the Indians during the winter and endeavor to heal the schism, so that the Indians should not merely refrain from hindering the expedition, but even actively aid it. "In the meantime," added the President, "we shall be able to remove the Spanish impediments." But Dunbar was authorized to make use of the men and stores for a shorter excursion, and in the interim they might select a fully qualified leader. The President also suggested that Dunbar should try to forward the account of this preliminary trip in time for effective use with Congress.¹⁵

In his reply Dunbar announced that the expedition had fortunately not started, that no geographer had been engaged, and that no one, unless it were Dr. Hunter, could feel disappointed because of the postponement. He and the doctor together should visit the Hot Springs at the head waters of the Washita. This was a region of great natural interest which the main party in the spring would be unable to visit, and he would doubtless obtain much available information from the hunters who lived at the post on the Washita. As another reason for postponing the main expedition, he added the fact (probably based on Minor's protest) that the Spaniards would have stopped it a little above "Nakitosh." In view of Salcedo's orders of the preceding May, that no American should be permitted to approach the Texas frontier, or to mark the boundaries of Louisiana, Dunbar's surmise appears to be well founded. The Washita offered the advantage of having its head waters protected by a group of rough, elevated hills from incursions of the predatory Osages, and it was likewise remote from the Spanish outposts. While not so important as either the Red or the Arkansas, the river promised to support a large future population, whose pioneer elements were already settling upon its banks, and its exploration was necessary to complete the chart of our new territorial acquisition. These considerations, to a certain extent, com-

¹⁵*Jefferson Papers*, Ser. 1, Vol. 10, No. 124.

pensated for the postponement of Jefferson's more comprehensive plan of frontier exploration.

The route of the Hunter-Dunbar expedition was so prudently chosen that no untoward event occurred to render it memorable. On the afternoon of October 16th, 1804, the start was finally made from St. Catherine's Landing, near Dunbar's plantation, "The Forest." The personnel of the party consisted of Sir William Dunbar, George Hunter and his son, a sergeant and twelve enlisted men and a negro servant of Dunbar's. The route covered the distance to the mouth of the Red River, up that stream to the Black, or Washita, to the Hot Springs, near the source of the latter, and thence the return by the same streams—the whole occupying some four months. Naturally the major part of the details of such an expedition consist of scientific descriptions of the country traversed and the trivial incidents of life in the wilderness. Except as tending to throw light upon the general methods of frontier exploration these details are now relatively unimportant. Yet observations upon the contemporary life encountered along the river banks and such experience as the party gained for the use of succeeding expeditions more than repaid the cost of the attempt.¹⁶

The population along the river was a never failing source of interest, especially to Dr. Hunter. The greater part consisted of Canadian French "of few wants and as little industry." There were a number of Spanish and French Creole families, apparently of the same general character as the Canadians, but interspersed with them were some of a higher order of industry and intelligence. Mingled with the elements surviving from the previous régimes were a few German, Irish, and American settlers of the frontier type, and the soldiers of the post on the Washita. About this post were grouped some 150 families of this nondescript population. A few scattered cabins above and below this place, with an occasional house of more pretentious appearance, constituted the settled portion of the country. The upper sources of the river were marked only by an infrequent hunter's lodge or "cache," utilized by the inhabitants, white and Indian, during the autumn hunting. The deer, bear, and wild fowl of the swamps and forests afforded the greater portion of the food supply of the region; but this was supplemented by an uncertain supply of Indian corn and by a few

¹⁶Cox, *loc. cit.*, 47, Notes 1 and 2.

wild cattle, kept for beef rather than for dairy purposes. Two large land grants, affording a fertile field for future litigation, were located upon the Washita, that of the Marquis of Maison Rouge being located below Fort Miró, while the more recent one to the Baron de Bastrop, soon to be connected with Burr's ambitious filibustering project, extended, twelve leagues square, above it. The greater part of the inhabitants appeared to be satisfied with the sway of Lieutenant Bowmar, the military commandant at the post.

At the Island of Mallet the travelers discovered, on taking the observation of November 15th, that they were within half a minute of the new boundary line of Orleans Territory—the thirty-third degree. Here they lost the Spanish moss of the lower courses of the river, left the alluvial swamps for higher land, and observed other marked changes that differentiated the country above and below the new limit. A week later they passed the Caddo "trace" leading from the Red to the Arkansas, and a little above this the Ecores de Fabri, some sand hills where tradition, as detailed by the guide, reported that leaden plates once marked the boundary between the French and Spanish colonial possessions. Naturally they found no vestige of these plates.¹⁷ From occasional parties of hunters they learned many facts concerning the Red, the Arkansas, the Missouri, and the Platte rivers, the Indians living upon them, and the vast plains through which they flowed.

In a measure this method of procuring information answered the purpose of Jefferson's extensive plan. Far greater service was rendered in the acquisition of practical experience for the guidance of future expeditions. It was speedily discovered that a special boat was needed to navigate the shallow waters of these interior streams. It was likewise noted that the discipline of a detail of enlisted men could not be maintained simply by a non-commissioned officer. More important still was the result of the experiment in transferring some baggage from the head of navigation on the Washita (the Fourche de Chalfat) to the Hot Springs. Though the distance was less than nine miles and the loads carried by the soldiers purposely made very light, they complained bitterly, and, as Dunbar thought, with justice, of the difficulties of this method of transporting baggage. The experiment led Dunbar to consider the vastly increased difficulty in using this scheme for a much larger company, between

¹⁷*Ibid.*, 49, Note 4.

the headwaters of the Red and the Arkansas, especially when they were wholly uncertain of the distance. In accordance with Dunbar's suggestion, the President afterwards modified this feature of his original plan.

The voyagers reached the head of navigation on the Washita on December 6th and started on their return journey on the 8th of January. The interval was employed in observations and excursions in the vicinity of the Hot Springs. On the 16th they were at the post on the Washita, where Dunbar left the party to return overland to his home. On the 31st Hunter brought the boat to St. Catherine's Landing, and on the 9th of the following month delivered the escort, safe and sound to a man, to Lieutenant Colonel Freeman at New Orleans.

In summarizing his work upon his return, Dunbar could report nothing of great importance. The Hot Springs formed a great natural curiosity, but the season was unfavorable for botanical work. The expedition, however, had afforded some experimental knowledge that might later prove useful. He had wished to prepare a brief abstract of the excursion, to be forwarded before the close of the session of Congress, but this was rendered impossible on account of the bad weather, the irregular mails, but, above all, by the loss of a month on account of their boat. Dr. Hunter's ideas in its construction were entirely wrong.¹⁸ Dunbar's unfortunate colleague had meanwhile taken passage at New Orleans for Philadelphia, where he arrived April 1st, 1805. His practice had suffered by his absence and he regretted that his medical knowledge had really been of so little service on the expedition. His son, in Philadelphia, and Dunbar, in Natchez, entered upon the tedious process of calculating their respective observations. After considerable delay their original journals and their summarized contents found appropriate resting places in the vault of the American Philosophical Society and in the documents of the Ninth Congress, where their lot was a century of almost uninterrupted repose. Nicholas King evidently made some use of these data in his government map of the following year, but it was not till 1810 that the publication of Pike's book with its accompanying maps first brought the information before the general public.

Although the Hunter-Dunbar expedition did not explore the Red

**Jefferson Papers*, 2d Ser., Vol. 28, Nos. 67 and 68.

River, as originally intended, the President, during this winter of 1804-5, received some information concerning that stream from another source. Dr. John Sibley was evidently emboldened by his previous correspondence with Claiborne over the limits of Louisiana to communicate directly with Jefferson, and he rightly approached by the scientific channel. After opening his first letter of March 20, 1804, with a few personal details, he devoted the remainder to a description of the bowwood tree. In closing, he begged leave to tender his services in any capacity the President might think proper to command.¹⁹ His reward came very quickly, first in the appointment as surgeon's mate for the forces stationed at Natchitoches, and later as Indian agent for Orleans Territory and the region south of the Arkansas.

Certain of Sibley's personal letters had already found their way into print and had aroused considerable comment in regard to his veracity. His personal reputation was by no means wholly proof against a storm of personal abuse that followed his appointment, late in 1804, as a member of Claiborne's council. The Governor doubted if this action of the President were wholly wise, but Jefferson did not believe that the charge of wife desertion and other attacks on Sibley's private character were sufficiently proven to count against his unquestionable good sense and information.²⁰ Having discovered Jefferson's interest in the aborigines, Sibley kept him supplied with Indian vocabularies and so retained his good will and that of his successor. He heightened this impression by a description of the Red River Valley, based on his travels in 1803 and 1804 along the settled portions of that river.²¹ In addition he gathered information from others, particularly from his interpreter, Francois Grappe. The latter was well acquainted with the Louisiana-Texas frontier, but the fact that he was then in Spanish pay would tend to vitiate his testimony, just as his employer's exuberant imagination often made his own statements untrustworthy.

Dr. Sibley was in no sense a trained scientific observer, so his description was largely confined to subjects that would appeal to

¹⁹*Ibid.*, Vol. 76, No. 6.

²⁰Cox, *loc. cit.*, 51 and 52. Since the preparation of this monograph the writer has examined the Sibley Letters in the possession of the Mo. Hist. Society. This has led to the opinion that in his family relations, at least, the Doctor was not so blameworthy as his enemies reported.

²¹*Annals 9th Cong., 2d Sess., 1089 et seq.*

the casual traveler or prospective settler. He mentioned the names of the various settlements upon the banks of the river, such as Rapides, Avoyelles, Natchitoches, Campti, etc., and also of the more important isolated establishments. He described the chief affluents of the Red, either from personal observation, or from the reports of others, and gave a fair representation of the river system, the soil, and its productions, from his practical agricultural standpoint, and made predictions that succeeding years have not verified. His description of the population was interesting from the fact that he showed the numerous elements that composed it and that the more progressive were non-native. In this particular the Red simply repeated what others had observed on the Washita. Natchitoches, the most important town, was only a miserable settlement, containing less than half a dozen notable structures, and its general economic condition was worse than in 1762. All of the industries that were important were apparently in American hands, and had been even while Spain controlled affairs. His report, even if it added little to scientific knowledge, was a most effective commentary upon four decades of Spanish government.

In the latter part of 1804 John Walker, whom Jefferson as well as Casa Calvo had mentioned in connection with exploration on the Sabine and Red, was reported as doing some surveying for the Spaniards whom he now served, on the Rio Grande and the Guadalupe. Claiborne and Turner attached little importance to this report.²² As if to emphasize the fact that the religious hold of the Spaniards was more enduring than their political sway, the Bishop of Nuevo Leon, in whose diocese Texas belonged, paid a pastoral visit to the town and garrison of Natchitoches. Here he was respectfully received by Captain Turner, as the bishop himself reports "with the honors of a general." The bishop further added that although he himself was very reserved and politic in his conversations, the French complained unceasingly of their situation under the new government. The malcontents expressed the desire to immigrate to Texas, which "those republicans" (the Americans) already claimed as far as the Rio Grande. Governor Claiborne was deeply impressed with the fact that the bishop kept a journal in which he recorded the latitude of many of the places visited and

²²Turner to Claiborne, December 27, 1804, *Claiborne Correspondence*, II. Parker, No. 7119.

the results of his minute inquiries regarding the geography of Louisiana, and that upon leaving Natchitoches he took the most direct route to the City of Mexico. Accordingly he characterized his visit as political rather than ecclesiastical in character.²³

We have already seen that Madison had objected to certain rumored changes in the garrison along the Florida and Texas frontiers as violating the *status quo*. This gave Casa Yrujo the opportunity to retort that his government had done nothing of the sort. But the Americans, in authorizing the expeditions of Lewis and Hunter and Dunbar, had broken the very condition they attempted to impose upon the Spaniards. His superiors had not expressly sanctioned the maintenance of the *status quo*, but had actually observed it; while the Americans, by exploring the country before they knew its limits, had authorized their troops to invade the possessions of the Spanish sovereign. The fact that this invasion was disguised as a scientific expedition did not render it a less hostile act. Madison did not carry on the controversy with Yrujo, with whom he was not on good terms, but informed Erving that they had communicated with him in regard to Lewis' expedition and had received no intimation that it was not satisfactory. Consequently they thought the other ones that were proposed equally unobjectionable. Claiborne, too, was ready to offer any necessary explanations on the subject. Erving was then temporarily filling Monroe's place in London, so many months were to pass before he could present these explanations in person to the Spanish court. Doubtless the delay was acceptable to the administration at home.

IV. BORDER RELATIONS WITH THE TEXAS INDIANS

During 1804 and 1805, in addition to the actual and contemplated exploring expeditions, the subject of Indian relations appealed strongly to the Louisiana and Texas officials. Indeed, Spanish authorities claimed that possible Indian alliances supplied the chief motive for Jefferson's interest in exploration. There was much in his instructions to Lewis and to Dunbar to justify this

²³Bishop of Nuevo Leon to Viceroy, June 20, 1805, *Bexar Archives*; Claiborne to Madison, June 6, 1805, *Claiborne Correspondence*, III. Parker, No. 7229.

²⁴Casa Yrujo to Madison, March 2, 1805. MSS., *Spanish Notes*, Vol. 1; Madison to Erving, March 15, 1805. *Instructions*, Vol. 6.

suspicion. But in addition there were numerous instances of mutual distrust among the officials along the disputed frontier that serve to throw additional light upon the critical events of 1806. While mere rumor had much to do with the reporting and interpretation of these events, there was sufficient truth to mark them as danger signals. This was particularly so in connection with the reported increase in frontier garrisons and other military movements which each nation was supposed to be undertaking.

The Indian situation had been a difficult one for Nimecio de Salcedo from the time that he became general commandant of the Interior Provinces. He was getting the situation well in hand when tidings of the prospective transfer redoubled his anxiety. At the same time, as if to give point to this feeling, he learned from Felix Vidal, the commandant at Concordia, that Robert Ashley and John House were organizing a party of fifty men in Natchez to visit the Comanches and other Indians in their vicinity. Ashley had been a member of Nolan's party and the mere mention of the latter's name in connection with this project aroused the worst fears of the Spaniard, and led him to request reinforcements from the militia of Nuevo Leon and Nuevo Santander. A portion of these responded promptly, but there seems to have been no occasion to employ them against a company rallying under a trading standard associated with the name of Nolan.¹

Before the Americans took possession of Louisiana Sibley represented the Caddoes as anxiously anticipating their coming, because their presence meant higher prices for their furs. A few months after that eventful act Captain Turner, the commanding officer at Natchitoches, wrote Governor Claiborne that he had received a visit from the Caddo Indians, who said that the Spaniards used to give them a present each year and that they wished to receive the same from the Americans. A few gifts from Turner satisfied them temporarily, but the request opened a problem of grave importance in American frontier policy. Claiborne reported the matter to Madison, gave a brief description of the tribe, and said that he should invite them to New Orleans. A later letter from Turner informed Claiborne of the privilege enjoyed by Murphy and Davenport in trading with the Spanish Indians. As this trade included

¹Salcedo to Iturrigaray, October 13, 1803. *Archivo General, Californias*, Vol. 22.

the privilege of supplying them with ammunition, the Americans, in case of difficulty with the Spaniards, might feel its evil effects. Accordingly he recommended the immediate establishment of American factories to divert the Indian trade from the Spaniards.²

While Captain Turner was approaching the subject of Indian relations through Governor Claiborne, Dr. Sibley was making similar representations directly to the President, and was likewise giving a political bias to his communications. In his letter of September 2, 1804, he wrote that the Indian trading company of Murphy, Davenport, *et al.*, most of whom had been or still were American citizens, carried on their operations through a Spanish officer at Nacogdoches, Texas. Naturally this company and the Spanish officer did all in their power to excite the Indians against the United States. If this trade ministering to an estimated Indian population of from thirty to forty thousand could be turned into the proper channel and be supplied from an American post on the Red River, the Indians, and especially the Pawnees and Comanches might become fast friends of the Americans.³

Unauthorized trappers and traders did not await formal action by the government. On July 16, 1804, Captain Turner informed Claiborne of a typical instance of this sort. A certain American named Sanders had penetrated some five hundred miles up the Red River to the Panis Indians and found them anxious to trade with the Americans. Sanders was pursued by the Spaniards, but managed to elude them and arrived safely at Natchitoches.⁴ The Spanish authorities rightly feared such attempts far more than a regular expedition that moved forward openly under governmental responsibility. The latter was subject to diplomatic pressure; no amount of frontier precaution could circumvent among Indian allies the subtle influence of the ambitious trader and errant trapper. In the far Southwest the peril from these became especially threatening during this period and added not a little to the anxiety with which the general commandant watched American aggres-

²Sibley to Claiborne, October 10, 1803. *Jefferson Papers*, Ser. 2, Vol. 76, No. 5; Turner to Claiborne, July 16, August 30, 1804. Parker, No. 7022 and 7043. *Claiborne Correspondence*, II. "Caddoes" is the name used to designate the Caddadachos of the Spaniards and the Caddadoquis of the French.

³Sibley to Jefferson, *loc. cit.*, No. 7.

⁴Turner to Claiborne, July 16, 1804. *Claiborne Correspondence*, II. Parker, 7022.

sion, which he was too weak to check with efficiency. A later report in October that three Americans of this class had been killed by the Indians near Natchitoches, may represent an indirect attempt of the Spaniards to check these unauthorized expeditions.⁵

While still acting as governor of Louisiana Manuel Salcedo reported to his brother that the Tenzas Indians were unwilling to remain under the jurisdiction of the United States and that from their character and religious preference they would make good Spanish subjects. Thereupon Nimecio de Salcedo proposed to admit them under the following regulations. They must settle between the Sabine and Trinity rivers. They must obey the Governor of Texas and the commandant of Nacogdoches, but could expect no subsistence from either. They must give prompt information of any new occurrences in their vicinity.⁶

In this same summer of 1804 Nimecio de Salcedo also proposed to emphasize the opposite policy of retaining the Indians already under his control. He wrote to the Governor of Texas to prevent the removal of the Cadadachos Indians into Louisiana, if it could be done peaceably.⁷ The governor's opinion of the movement of the Indians seemed somewhat at variance with that of his superior. At least, he interpreted any movement of Indians from Louisiana into Texas as a bad omen. Possibly, in view of the trouble the Spaniards had to control the Indians already in Texas, his was the proper attitude. In a letter of the following month Salcedo favored presents of tobacco and clothing for the Indians as a proof of Spanish friendship.⁸

According to Captain Turner the Spaniards were at this time inviting the Alabama Indians to settle in Texas and assist in repelling the Americans. He also learned that the Aish Indians of Texas, instigated by his opponents, were trying to persuade the small tribe of the Casados to move from the Opelousas district east of the Sabine to some point west of that river, and threatening them with

⁵Claiborne to Madison, October 5, 1804. *Ibid.* Parker, 7065.

⁶N. Salcedo to Casa Calvo, May 8, 1804. *Legajo*, No. 185. *Papeles procedentes de la Isla de Cuba, Archivo General de Indias*, Seville.

⁷Salcedo to Elguezabal, July 17, 1804. MSS., *Bezar Archives*.

⁸*Id.* to *Id.*, August 14, 1804, *Ibid.* A statement of Gilbert Leonard for June, 1803 (*Archivo General, Mexico Historia*, 431), shows that some \$3500 worth of merchandise was at that date sent by Gov. Manuel Salcedo to Natchitoches under the conduct of Edward Murphy. This was to be used as needed among the Texas Indians.

death if they did not. The Cousate warned an American settler near the head of the Sabine to move from that region, for the Spaniards were trying to stir up all the border Indians against the Americans.⁹

In view of these facts Claiborne made a vigorous protest to Casa Calvo. The latter believed that they were the exaggerated reports of interested traders, but promised to inform the General Commandant. At the same time Claiborne urged Turner to redouble his efforts to attach the Caddoes to the American cause and empowered him to give rations and small trifles to them and to other honest and well-disposed Indians. As the Caddoes were the intermediaries for the Pawnees, who desired American trade, he might regale them to the extent of two hundred dollars. The hostility of this tribe towards the Spaniards, possibly influenced by these measures, later caused the failure of a general council which the Spaniards attempted to assemble.¹⁰

In reporting these conditions to Madison, Claiborne promised to use the greatest prudence and caution in dealing with his Indian and Spanish neighbors, but he feared trouble on account of the unfriendly disposition of the latter. The situation became still more complicated when Turner informed him that the Spanish authorities had granted new privileges to the trading firm of Barr, Murphy, and Davenport. This gave them the exclusive right to trade with the Indians in furs and horses for a period of twelve years. They might also settle a tract of land near the Texas coast. Murphy was to be the commandant of this new settlement, while a certain Ormond was to ply the trade between Nacogdoches and the Washita and to introduce settlers from the latter place into Texas.¹¹

With the outbreak of war between England and Spain, in December, 1804, Salcedo believed that a new danger threatened his command. Accordingly he ordered the Governor of Texas to use additional measures to preserve the allegiance of the Indians and to keep intact the pretense of friendship and harmony existing be-

⁹Turner to Wilkinson, October 15, 1804, *Am. State Papers, For. Rel.*, II, 690.

¹⁰Turner to Claiborne, September 9, October 13, and November 21, 1804; Claiborne to Madison, November 3, 1804, *Claiborne Correspondence*, II, Parker, No. 7052, 7073, 7092, and 7107. Casa Calvo to Claiborne, November 7, 1804. Enclosed in Parker, No. 7103.

¹¹Turner to Claiborne, December 8, 1804. *Ibid.* Parker, No. 7110.

tween Spain and the United States.¹² These orders show that in the war waged by Spain and France against Great Britain he expected the United States to side with the latter, and, as on previous occasions, to plan first an attack upon the Spanish colonies. The natural corollary to this fear would be a reinforcement of the garrisons on the exposed frontier and to this task he seems to have devoted his insufficient resources.

On November 26, 1804, Captain Turner reported the first actual aggression by the Spaniards. A non-commissioned officer and ten men had taken up a position east of the Sabine at La Nana, near the ranch of William Murphy, the Indian trader, and about forty miles west of Natchitoches. The concession recently granted to this trading firm may have stimulated this movement. Turner, however, expressed no apprehension of any great force on the hither side of the Rio Grande, because of the scarcity of provisions. The very inhabitants were in danger of starvation from a failure of the crops and the rapacity of the priests, and depended upon the supplies obtained from Natchitoches, their nearest market, or from beyond the Rio Grande. The few settlers of Bayou Pierre enjoyed a fair crop that year, but this was merely sufficient for themselves. Turner thought the province of Texas could produce only enough beef and pork to supply five hundred men for a year.¹³

In his next monthly report Turner mentioned some recent arrivals at Nacogdoches and stated that a thousand families had been ordered from the populous parts of Mexico to the Texas frontier and that troops from Havana were to garrison Matagorda. His interpreter, Duforet, had received information that Don Antonio de Cordero, the governor of Coahuila, was to exercise control over Texas also, and that the present governor of the latter province was to take up his residence at Adaes.¹⁴ Claiborne did not concern himself greatly over these reports, for he anticipated an early amicable adjustment of all disputes between the United States and Spain. But he informed Madison, and the latter immediately dispatched a long résumé of these rumors to Armstrong at Paris. Doubtless his intention was something more than to interest the French gov-

¹²Salcedo to Governor of Texas, April 8, 1805. *General Archives*, Austin, Texas.

¹³Turner to Claiborne, November 21, 1804. Parker, No. 7107.

¹⁴*Id.* to *Id.* December 27, 1804. *Claiborne Correspondence*, II. Parker, No. 7119.

ernment in idle frontier tales. He may have hoped to bring pressure upon its officials to aid Monroe in gaining the Floridas and in settling the western boundary.¹⁵

At the same time Madison addressed to Casa Yrujo at Washington a vigorous protest against these assumed aggressions that drew from the Spanish minister an equally vigorous rejoinder. The latter stated that though not informed of the increase in garrisons, of which Madison complained, yet the fact itself did not seem to him at all improbable. In view of Mr. Pinckney's conduct at Madrid and of certain disturbances on the Florida border, such action would be merely a matter of ordinary precaution. He believed that both governments were devoted to a policy of moderation, that Spain had no hostile intentions against the United States, nor the latter any desire to adopt retaliatory measures. He then went on to complain of the various exploring expeditions as a violation of the *status quo* upon which the Americans insisted.¹⁶ Madison vouchsafed no direct answer to this, but contented himself with inditing a long dispatch to Pinckney.

In December, 1804, as a result of Claiborne's representations and Sibley's political finesse, and as a necessary sequence to the creation of Orleans Territory, Secretary Dearborn requested the doctor to act occasionally as Indian agent. He was to hold conferences with the Indians in his vicinity. With an allowance for himself of four dollars per day and expenses, he should attempt to keep them well disposed towards the American government by a judicious distribution of some three thousand dollars worth of supplies and provisions. He might employ an interpreter in his dealings and he was to assure the Indians that if they remained friendly and peaceable they could rely on the justice and friendship of the United States. If they expected to be treated like children by the Great Father at Washington they must break off all relations with any other power. The instructions closed with the statement

¹⁵Parker, No. 7119; Madison to Armstrong, March 5, 1805; to Erving, March 15, 1805. MSS., *Instructions*, Vol. 6.

¹⁶Casa Yrujo to Madison, March 12, 1805. MSS., *Spanish Notes*, I. Merry wrote that the report was current in Washington that the Viceroy was attempting to raise sixteen new regiments. The English minister took considerable interest in Casa Yrujo's presence at the American capital during this month. Merry to Harrowby, No. 16, March 29, 1805. F. O. Am., II, 5-45.

that the Secretary would expect a report in the course of six months."

The first effect of this appointment was to unsettle Indian affairs, for Claiborne's new instructions did not permit him to interfere, while the functions of the new agent were greatly circumscribed. Traders passed to the Indian tribes with very little restraint, except from the frontier commandants, who, in keeping with Claiborne's suggestion, attempted to keep the trade simply a licensed traffic in peltries with the Indians and not a concealed horse trade with the Spaniards. Then, too, there was some question in Louisiana regarding Dr. Sibley's fitness for his position, that caused the Governor some uneasiness, but as we have seen this was apparently explained away to the satisfaction of the Washington authorities. Early in the following spring, Sibley exhibited the first result of his appointment in the form of a report upon the Indian tribes of his vast district. In commending this report Claiborne repeated his counsel to pay particular attention to the Caddoes, who seemed to have influence over the others and were well disposed toward the Americans.¹⁸

This report is the first attempt by the Americans to estimate the importance of the Indian alliance for which they and the Spaniards were striving. Sibley's information is based on his own observations and such knowledge as he could glean from the other meagre sources at his disposal. He relied especially upon his interpreter, Francois Grappe. The latter's father, while an officer in the French service, had acted as superintendent of Indian affairs at a post some five hundred miles above Natchitoches. Here Grappe was born and lived for thirty years. He was a man of influence among the Indians and likewise enjoyed Sibley's confidence; yet he was at the same time in Spanish pay.

In this report Sibley estimated the fighting strength of some thirty tribes in his jurisdiction at twenty-eight hundred men. This does not include the Comanches nor a coast tribe which he calls the Cances. Their combined strength (even granting the inexactness of the above estimate) would, indeed, have been a dreaded factor, had they united in favor of either Spaniard or American,

¹⁷Dearborn to Sibley, December 13, 1804. *Indian Office, Letter Book B*, 30.

¹⁸*Claiborne Correspondence*, III, January 27, 29, March 25, June 10, 1805... Parker, Nos. 7142, 7145, 7177, and 7232.

or even against both; but no such union was possible. Sibley represented the greater part of these Indians as having been friendly to the French and later names a number of tribes as expressly acknowledging French jurisdiction. Such were those living near St. Bernard's Bay who were also equally well disposed towards their American successors. The Spanish officials claimed a nominal sovereignty over nearly all the tribes of the region, but their rule had not made their power respected, and in some cases the Indians terrorized and held in subjection the scattered settlements of the Spaniards, rather than endured their capricious attempts to govern them. On the whole, the advantage in the struggle for Indian allies were in favor of the greater resources and energy of the Americans.¹⁹

On the 23d of the following May, Dearborn expressed his gratification at the receipt of this report, and added:

At all times use all means to conciliate the Indians generally, and more especially such natives as might, in case of a rupture with Spain, be useful or mischievous to us. *None ought to engage your attention so early as those who reside in the immediate vicinity of the Bay of St. Bernard*, and from your description of their present temper and disposition, it will require no great exertion to draw them firmly to the interests of the United States. They may be assured that *they and all other red people within the limits of the United States* will be treated with undeviating friendship as long as they shall conduct themselves fairly and with good faith towards the government and citizens of the United States.²⁰

This letter, significant for its territorial claims as well as for the Indian policy outlined, closed with the suggestion that Sibley prepare the minds of those Indians in the vicinity of the Red River, Attacapas, and Opelousas, for a proposed land survey by the United States government. If it should be necessary to run lines through their lands, in order to make the survey complete, they were not to be alarmed. "Not an acre will be taken," the Secretary affirmed, "except with payment and treaty under the auspices of the United States and free concession on their part." At the same

¹⁹For the report, see *Annals 9th Cong., 2d Sess.*, 1078, *et seq.*

²⁰Dearborn to Sibley, May 23, 1805. *Indian Office, Letter Book B*, 80. The italics in the extract are those of the present writer. In a letter of October 17, 1805, giving Sibley a commission as permanent agent, Dearborn hopes that Sibley has made "a proper impression" on the Indians near St. Bernard's Bay (*Ibid.*, 2).

time Jefferson wrote to Claiborne that "their rights and comfort would be sacredly cherished."²¹

The number and strength of these Indians, as reported by Sibley, surprised the Washington authorities. Dearborn wrote that our general policy was to be one of friendship towards them and that suitable presents should be made to their chiefs when it could be done with propriety. Jefferson was doubly impressed with the necessity of retaining the friendship with which these natives regarded the Americans. Accordingly, October 17, 1805, Sibley was given a commission as regular Indian agent at a salary of \$1000 per year. He was furnished with the customary goods for trading and instructed to urge some of the principal chiefs, especially of the Caddoes, to visit Washington, or at least New Orleans. When Jefferson repeated his stock request for Indian vocabularies, he reminded Sibley that he must spare no means to convince them of our justice and liberality and to attach them to our side.²²

Salcedo and his subordinates were especially displeased with the policy of the American government in making Sibley an Indian agent. The general commandant refers to him as "a revolutionist, the friend of change and a most bitter enemy of public peace." He bitterly denounced his policy of selling goods to the Indians at cost as a means of attracting their support in case of hostilities. The governor of Texas thought that the "revolutionary" Sibley should be forced to leave the frontier, but felt that the American government was equally responsible for his actions. He favored a vigorous protest through Casa Calvo or some other person near the American government.²³ Hampered by the vast distances which separated the strategic points of his command, Salcedo requested reinforcements for Texas from the neighboring provinces, from Calleja at San Luis Potosi, and from the viceroy himself. He reported that he should need one hundred and fifty extra men to cope with Sibley's machinations in carrying out the policy of the American government. "Only a declaration of war," he savagely wrote, "will reveal the perfidy of its emissaries among the In-

²¹*Jefferson Papers*, 1st Ser., Vol. 10, No. 300.

²²*Indian Office, Letter Book B*, 2; Washington, *Works of Jefferson*, IV, 580.

²³Elguezabal to Salcedo, June 19, 1805; N. Salcedo to Yturrigaray, July 16, 1805. *Archivo General, Provincias Internas*, Vol. 239.

dians."²⁴ To his vigorous specific requests he obtained only a belated reply, deploring the situation and indefinitely promising to raise more troops, if necessary.

In the summer of 1805 Salcedo learned of a specific case of Sibley's activity. A certain Englishman (probably American) who had previously escaped from Spanish pursuit, conducted a party of thirteen men and women of the Tahuayas Indians to Natchitoches for the purpose of receiving gifts from Sibley. Dionisio Valle, now commandant at Nacogdoches in place of Ugarte, ordered the corporal in charge at Bayou Pierre to prevent the return of the party through that settlement. Governor Elguezabal approved of this order, but transmitted Valle's request for a reinforcement of one hundred men to Salcedo for action. Salcedo ordered Francois Grappe to Bayou Pierre to investigate the Tahuayas incident, and suggested that the garrison at Nacogdoches should be increased gradually by sending forward a few men at a time on pretext of carrying the mails and then permitting them to remain at the post. If the Tahuayas declare hostilities he should apply for help to the neighboring provinces.²⁵ From Sibley we have an account that seems to supplement the above information. According to him the Spanish officer threatened a Caddo chief passing through Bayou Pierre to Natchitoches. When on his return the Spaniard tried to stop him the Indian threatened to wipe out the whole settlement; whereupon the other desisted from his attempt to interfere.²⁶ This may refer to the incident in which the Tahuayas figured, or it may be an unfortunate mistake of the officer in attempting to stop the wrong Indians. At any rate, the incident aroused all the savages of the vicinity. Salcedo blamed Dr. Sibley for the whole affair, because of his machinations to gain the allegiance of the Indians. At the same time he bade the governor of Texas omit no means to gain the friendship of the Indians for the Spaniards. In keeping with this purpose he suggested the construction of canoes on the Trinity to ply between the two Spanish posts and to trade with the natives on its banks.²⁷

²⁴Salcedo to Cordero, October 8, 22, 1805. *Bexar Archives*.

²⁵N. Salcedo to Yturrigaray, July 16, 1805, and accompanying documents. *Provincias Internas*, Vol. 239. Among those furnishing this information we have the names of a "Ruquih" or "Ruquie," evidently the "Roquier" mentioned on page 35, and Bernardo Despalier, inhabitants of Natchitoches.

²⁶*Annals 9th Cong., 2d Sess., Appendix, 1077.*

²⁷Cf. note 25.

Ever since the transfer the Spaniards had been kept informed of their rivals' movements in Louisiana through the activity of Felix Trudeau, the former commandant of Natchitoches and now a resident of that community. In an irregular way Samuel Davenport and Edward Murphy, naturalized Spanish subjects and fur traders, gave information to both parties, while Francois Grappe acted with equal readiness as Indian agent for Sibley or for Salcedo.²⁸ In February, 1805, Dearborn wrote Wilkinson that it was highly desirable to learn the meaning of reported Spanish movements in "Louisiana and vicinity." He desired particularly "to know of any such between the Bravo and Red Rivers and what was doing in San Antonio and St. Bernard Bay." He was to employ trappers and hunters and to pay them while in government service.²⁹

Sibley had already employed such a messenger among the Choc-taws to spy upon the movements of the Spaniards. He now learned that the latter were erecting forts at Matagorda and on the Trinity. They were assuring the Indians that the Spaniards were their only true friends. The idea that the Americans would permanently hold the country west of the Mississippi was pure wind; the Indians, therefore, should come over into the service of their Great Father over the water, who welcomed them not only with his hand, but with his whole arm.³⁰ Early in September Wilkinson reported from St. Louis that a certain Captain Stille "had again been despatched to the westward and I hope he may, before this reaches you, have been able to ascertain and apprise for you the disposition of the Spaniards at the Orcoquisanes [Orcoquisac=Trinity] and Matagorda. Captain Turner, too, may, I hope, from a [reconnaissance?] which he was instructed to make, have been able to give you information of the dispositions at Nacogdoches and St. Antonio."³¹ These references show that the Americans were ready to counteract the work of their rivals by using the latter's own

²⁸Rodriguez to Cordero, December 18, 1805; Salcedo to Cordero, August 13, 1805, *Bexar Archives*; Turner to Claiborne, August 30, 1804. *Claiborne Correspondence*, II; Parker, No. 7043. *Annals 9th Cong., 2d Sess., Appendix 1097*.

²⁹Dearborn to Wilkinson, February 26, 1805. MSS., *Wilkinson Papers*, II, Chicago Historical Society.

³⁰Turner to Claiborne, December 8, 1804, *Claiborne Correspondence*, II; Parker, No. 7110; Sibley to Secretary of War, May 31, 1805, *Am. State Papers, For. Rel.*, II, 690.

³¹Wilkinson to Dearborn, September 7, 1805. *Wilkinson Papers*, II.

methods. The information thus obtained from the Indians was of such a character as to lead them to exaggerate the strength of their opponents and to misinterpret their movements. The others were equally misinformed, as was evident from a rumor, current in the fall of 1805, that Sibley, with a party of American traders, had penetrated to a village of the Tahuacanes and that another American party had erected a fortification at Palo de los Arcos.³²

By the opening of 1805 the Americans were persuaded more firmly than ever that the Spaniards were augmenting their forces in Texas, and that Grimarest, the captain general of Cuba, was coming thither with four thousand troops. This led Claiborne to broach the subject in conversation with Casa Calvo. He stated that he thought this increase in the Texas garrisons, while negotiations were pending a distinct breach of the *status quo* which Jefferson desired to maintain. The Spanish commissioner asserted that the only military change in the disputed area was the augmenting of certain garrisons by the troops withdrawn from Louisiana the previous year. But he took occasion to point out that Pinckney's course at Madrid and the passage of the Mobile Act justified the supposed plan of the Spanish King to send Grimarest with reinforcements to Texas. However, he thought that Jefferson's recent representations had satisfied the King; at any rate, he had heard nothing of Grimarest's arrival in Texas, and did not expect to do so.³³

Claiborne doubted the candor of the Marqués in giving this explanation, and his distrust was further strengthened by reports from the frontier obtained through the Choctaw spies employed by Sibley and Turner. These reports seem to be based merely on Spanish braggadocio, but Turner believed that their rivals were planning to gain the Indians and thus gradually to edge themselves along toward New Orleans. Claiborne reported the matter to Madison, but both the Secretary and the officials on the immediate frontier recognized that these boasts and the rumors of the enemy's forces in Texas were greatly exaggerated. Indeed, on April 1, 1805, the commandant at Nacogdoches reported but fifty-one soldiers at that post, while Sibley's Choctaw spies reported a small number

³²Dionisio Valle to Cordero, October 3, 1805. *Bexar Archives*.

³³Claiborne to Madison, April 19, 1805. *Claiborne Correspondence*, III; Parker, Nos. 7193, 7194.

only at Orcoquisac and could give no definite account of any at Matagorda.³⁴

In his letter to Sibley of June 6, 1805, Claiborne mentioned another instance of apparent Spanish hostility. He stated that the utterances of the priests at Natchitoches had a tendency to arouse the inhabitants against the government. They represented the Americans as infidels with whom their charges should not associate, and asserted that the new authorities would not protect the religion under which their parents had lived and died. This was a much more serious charge than the characterization of the previous year that the Americans were "mere hogs," who did not "live like Christians." It was rendered more alarming by the recent pastoral visit of the Bishop of Nuevo Leon to Natchitoches. Claiborne believed that the geographical and political purposes of this visit far outweighed the religious motive. Indeed, in 1836 the Mexican minister at Washington cited this visit as evidence that Spain then exercised political jurisdiction to the Red River.³⁵

From the exposed frontier the American officials continued to send alarming reports. Sibley mentioned the arrival of five hundred families at San Antonio—a manifest absurdity, for no such number ever arrived there during Spanish rule.³⁶ The expected arrival of an additional hundred soldiers at Nacogdoches also excited considerable interest among the Americans. Turner later mentioned the anticipated arrival of Grimarest with seven companies of soldiers for San Antonio and a captain and full company for Nacogdoches. He gave more likelihood to his statement by saying that a certain Mr. Shabas of Natchitoches had been invited to come to San Antonio to meet the new Spanish official. The march of Creole troops, accompanied as usual by their families, may serve as a possible basis for the exaggerated reports of new settlers for Texas. As we know from other sources, colonial officials like Folch and Casa Calvo were advising the strengthening of Spanish garrisons in Texas and Florida, the creation of new posts on the gulf coast, and new settlements in Texas, but Spanish resources were not then equal to the enterprise.³⁷ However, Salcedo did his

³⁴Parker, No. 7229. Also *Am. State Paps., For. Rel.*, II, 691, and Report of Ugarte, April 1, 1805, *Bexar Archives*.

³⁵Parker, Nos. 7229 and 7232; *Documentos para la Historia de Mexico*, Ser. 1, Tomo, VI.

³⁶*Am. State Paps., For. Rel.*, II, 691.

³⁷Robertson, Nos. 4885, 4934, 4985, 4993.

best with the few forces at his disposal, despite the indecisive course of the viceroy, Iturrigaray. In July, 1805, the former complained that the building of fortifications at Natchitoches indicated the arrival of additional American troops and contrasted this with conditions in Texas, where he had only three hundred men to hold five frontier posts and guard the province against the Americans and Indians. In the following month he requested auxiliaries from Nuevo Leon and Nuevo Santander, and later ordered two hundred of these to be stationed at Espiritu Santo [Matagorda], in order to prevent the landing of a hostile expedition in that quarter. Previous orders show that this expected expedition may have been British, but the Spanish reinforcements could be used against the Americans, if necessary.³⁸

In June, 1805, came the report from Natchitoches of the finding of Bernard La Harpe's Journal—a manuscript history of Louisiana from 1699 to 1723. This later proved a most effective aid to the American claim to the Rio Grande.³⁹ In addition to this, early in September, Dr. Sibley collected and forwarded to Washington a mass of testimony designed to prove that previous to 1762 the French had made permanent settlements on the Red River, several hundred miles above Natchitoches, as well as at Bayou Pierre. President Jefferson used this information in his next annual message, and it and the Journal later formed the basis of much wordy diplomatic discussion.⁴⁰

By midsummer 1805, the feeling of distrust and jealousy on the part of both Americans and Spaniards had brought about a situation on the western frontier that needed slight encouragement to break out into actual hostilities. In October some robberies on the part of the Spaniards reported from Opelousas and Bayou Pierre added to the feeling of resentment, and showed the danger to be anticipated from a continuance of unauthorized Indian trading in this region, while there was no settled policy on the part of either government.⁴¹ Wilkinson sums up the situation in a letter to Casa Calvo, in which he expresses regret at certain features of Burr's

³⁸Salcedo to Iturrigaray, July 16, August 3, 1805; Salcedo's "Military Record," August 20, 1805. *Bexar Archives*.

³⁹Gayarre, *Hist. of La.*, IV, 111; Ford, *Writings of Jefferson*, XI, 20.

⁴⁰J. Q. Adams to Onis, March 12, 1818, in *Am. State Paps., For. Rel.*, IV, 78.

⁴¹*Am. State Paps., For. Rel.*, II, 694, 695.

recent visit to New Orleans: "Of late the relations between our governments have not been the most cordial, but I hope they will be such by mutual concession."⁴² Contemporary events on the still more critical Florida frontier and the course of negotiation at Madrid and at Washington, would seem to indicate a far different conclusion.

V. MONROE'S SPECIAL MISSION TO SPAIN

It was some months after Monroe received the instructions that were to guide him in his special mission to Madrid¹ that he deemed it advisable to set out for that capital. Meanwhile Charles Pinckney, the American minister to Spain, disregarding his instructions to do no negotiating in regard to Louisiana, had involved himself in a diplomatic muddle which forced Jefferson and Madison to comply with a request for his recall.² In regard to the western boundary of Louisiana he had done nothing more than report the displeasure of the Spanish officials at the near approach of the United States to their Mexican territories and obtain an inexact statement from the work of Lopez in favor of the Rio Grande as its western limit. He reported the prospect of war between Spain and Great Britain, and this was formally declared in December, 1804. He also mentioned the possible reinforcement of Spanish garrisons in the Floridas and Mexico.³ His interest as well as that of the majority of our officials was too closely centered upon the Floridas to permit greater attention to the western frontier.

Meanwhile the Spanish government had withdrawn its protest against the cession of Louisiana to the United States and had thus gained the covert support of Napoleon and Talleyrand. While this was likewise largely concerned with West Florida and certain claims for commercial spoliation, the crafty French minister did not neglect the western boundary of Louisiana. Cevallos sent him as those of Laussat a request to check such utterances upon this limit. In answer Talleyrand informed Turreau, the new French

⁴²Under date September 14, 1805. MSS., *Wilkinson Papers*, II.

¹See *THE QUARTERLY*, XVII, 14-15.

²Casa Yrujo to Cevallos, Phil., October 26, 1804. *Adams Transcripts*. Robertson, No. 5007.

³Cf. *Spanish Despatches*, VI. MSS., Bureau of Indexes and Archives; and *Letters in Relation to Burr's Conspiracy*, under date of November 4, 1804. MSS., Bureau of Rolls and Library, Department of State.

minister at Washington, that he should attempt unofficially to restrain the United States from any measures regarding its western boundary that might annoy Spain.⁴ At the same time he outlined to Gravina, the Spanish ambassador at Paris, a most conciliatory plan for settling this boundary, and claimed that Napoleon would have employed it had he taken possession of Louisiana. From the gulf the representatives of each nation were to draw a line connecting its scattered frontier settlements. Then somewhere in the intervening space, in a spirit of mutual friendship, they should designate the actual boundary.⁵

It is needless to point out that this plan differs widely from Victor's instructions and the utterances of Laussat, but Cevallos closely adhered to it in the succeeding negotiation with Monroe. Talleyrand further assured Cevallos that the United States could never use Louisiana as a basis for settlements on the Pacific, for any boundary agreed upon would be far removed from the western coast.⁶ In stating this, however, he is reassuring the Spaniard by greatly discounting the expansive spirit of the American people, as later voiced by John Quincy Adams. Despite his assurance to Gravina there were hints that in one way the French government might be led to favor the United States. Livingston suggested this when he mentioned that the desire of Spain to limit us on the west might be balanced by the needs of the French treasury.⁷ Marbois and his subordinates repeated this with greater emphasis when Monroe passed through Paris on his way to Madrid. Money, and plenty of it, would secure a successful result to his negotiations.⁸

A year before, just after the Louisiana Treaty, Monroe had been uncertain what action to take in regard to his joint commission with Pinckney to treat for the cession of the Floridas. Subsequent events show that by his indecision he then lost the opportunity to force Spain to cede them. At the same time his own ignorance in regard to Louisiana would probably have led him to some unwise concession west of the Mississippi. Then, too, Napoleon directly intimated that he should not go to Madrid and Monroe acquiesced.

⁴H. Adams, *History of United States*, II, 294, 295.

⁵*Ibid.*, 299, 300.

⁶*Ibid.*, 300; cf. also Gravina to Talleyrand, August 8, 1804. *Aff. Etgr. Supp.*, VIII, p. 161.

⁷Hamilton, *Writings of Monroe*, IV, 305.

⁸*Ibid.*, 281, 282.

As the months wore on neither he nor his superiors at home grew less perplexed. They desired him for the governorship of Louisiana, they needed him in London, and they wished to send him to Madrid, where he might undo Pinckney's blunders and wring concessions from Spain. Instead, when he reached Spain, he unqualifiedly approved Pinckney's course, and after battling in vain for four months against Spanish lethargy and French venality, returned discomfited to London. In this whole series of indecisive transactions Monroe certainly appears as a Hamlet of diplomacy with no final tragic scene to honor his pitiful play.

On his arrival in Paris, Monroe encountered Livingston, the retiring minister, whom he and his friends thoroughly distrusted, and Armstrong, his successor, upon whom they likewise bestowed their distrust. With the unwilling aid of these two doubting associates, he attempted to reanimate Napoleon's worthless promise of the previous year, to assist him in the Spanish negotiation. It is true that Napoleon had not intimated that the time was favorable for this, but Monroe felt certain that he could choose no better moment than the eve of hostilities between Spain and Great Britain. Accordingly, through Talleyrand, he addressed a long note to the Emperor, in which he discussed the claims of the United States against Spain and the boundaries of Louisiana. He explained that the American Congress had authorized the President to take possession of the ancient boundaries of that possession, but the executive had refrained from doing so in order to give time for explanations and adjustment. Thus he glosses over Napoleon's refusal to sanction his journey to Spain a year before. He presented a brief argument in favor of the American claim to the Bravo, but devoted a much greater space to West Florida, a matter then considered infinitely more important. Notwithstanding his generally conciliatory tone, Monroe suggested that war might follow the failure of his mission.⁹

His note remained unanswered until he had set out for Madrid. Both he and his colleagues looked upon his task as foredoomed to failure. Yet a regard for consistency, a vain striving after real independence in European diplomacy impelled him to go forward. Monroe was now forced to believe that the Spaniards, fortified by

⁹Monroe to Talleyrand, November 8, 1804. *Am. State Papers, For. Rel.*, II, 634.

Talleyrand's assurance, and Casa Yrujo's representations, viewed his approach to Madrid with indifference. The French officials, with appetite whetted by the Louisiana transaction, looked upon his failure as the precursor of another excellent bargain for themselves and their government. Worse than all, he distrusted Livingston and Armstrong. Before he left Paris he received some intimation that Talleyrand would make an unfavorable report to Napoleon in regard to his memoir, and this confirmed the impression that his colleagues were not supporting his measures with sufficient vigor. From Bordeaux, December 16, 1804, he sent to Madison a most gloomy view of the situation in Paris. Nevertheless, he expressed himself to his friend, Fulwar Skipwith, then in the French capital, as determined to pursue the object entrusted to him "with zeal and diligence and [I] trust with success."¹⁰ A few days later, at Paris, Armstrong received from Talleyrand a sarcastic note that removed every doubt of Monroe's failure.¹¹

The administration at Washington did not need Armstrong's communication nor Monroe's mournful missive from Bordeaux to show the prospective failure of this special mission. Early in January Turreau and Casa Yrujo held their celebrated interview with Madison, when they verbally notified him of the conclusion reached by their respective governments that West Florida formed no part of the Louisiana Purchase and that the United States must abandon its commercial claims against Spain.¹² While this information was hardly unexpected, Madison was exceedingly embarrassed at their method in expressing it as a joint decision. But he asserted that the United States would interpret these questions to suit itself. The Secretary made no mention of the western boundary and Turreau inferred that he placed little value upon it. The French minister believed that Madison emphasized West Florida in order to enhance the political effect of the Louisiana Purchase.¹³ We may believe that he forbore to mention the western boundary in order to avoid another crushing disappointment.

¹⁰Hamilton, *Writings of Monroe*, IV, 294; Monroe to Skipwith, December 18, 1804. MSS., Lenox Branch, New York Public Library.

¹¹*Am. State Papers, For. Rel.*, II, 635; Adams, *History of United States*, II, 311.

¹²*Ibid.*, 273; Merry to Harrowby, No. 2, *Foreign Office, America*, II, 5-45.

¹³Turreau to Talleyrand, January 27, 1805. MSS., *Adams Transcripts, French State Papers*, Vol. III.

A few days before, while vaguely discussing this question with the French minister, Madison casually asked what sort of divisional line the other considered the best. Turreau favored river courses, but Madison suggested mountain chains, obviously having in view those of New Mexico. Casa Yrujo, to whom the French minister reported this conversation, coincided with the suggestions of Talleyrand to Gravina, mentioned above. This would place an extensive desert area between Spain and the United States. Such would form the best sort of barrier between the two powers.¹⁴ Casa Yrujo was very anxious to humiliate Madison, for whom he personally felt great contempt, and whom he regarded as the representative of an administration willing to profit from Spain's necessities. He thought the Americans should have made a more tempting offer for the Floridas. He believed that in exchange for the latter they were ready to offer a liberal cash payment, together with the greater part of the right bank of the Mississippi. In such a case he expected them to reserve for themselves the districts of Attakapas and Opelousas, together with the banks of the Washita and Red rivers, where the population was rapidly increasing.

Casa Yrujo believed that this interview with Madison would materially lighten the burden of Cevallos' negotiation with Monroe. But he was not equally successful in supplying his superior with information in regard to the general character of Louisiana and its western limits. He was far from this region and without books or other sources of information, so that any opinion that he could form was hardly worth while. He stated that Du Pratz had mentioned the Spanish settlement at Adaes, and suggested that a meridional line from this point, utilizing the north and south courses of certain rivers, would be sufficiently well marked to form a good boundary. This would also relieve their colonial authorities from any anxiety in regard to the presence of the Americans.¹⁵

Although Casa Yrujo frankly confessed his own ignorance, he suggested a most interesting source of information. A talented American gentleman, whom he thought a former correspondent of Cevallos and Godoy, had promised him a memoir upon the country. In his correspondence he refers to this gentleman as both

¹⁴Robertson, No. 5021.

¹⁵*Ibid.* If such a line were drawn to the northwest rather than due north, it would approximate Jefferson's final instructions. See THE QUARTERLY, XVII, 15.

No. 1 and No. 13, but he is none other than the many-sided James Wilkinson. Casa Yrujo had asked him to prepare a plan of the western limits of Louisiana, and to establish the line so as to preserve to Spain Adaes, Nacogdoches, and the Sabine River, and at the same time to utilize the other river courses as suggested above. Wilkinson possessed his confidence, and he hoped soon to forward the memoir by express. There is a possibility that Cevallos may have had this, if prepared, in time to use in his reply to Monroe and Pinckney, on April 26th, and, if so, it suggests an interesting situation in which the commander of the American army thwarts the diplomatic efforts of his chief. It is possible to perceive a more likely connection between this suggestion of the Spanish minister and the Neutral Ground Agreement that Wilkinson himself made with Herrera nearly two years later.

In the following month Talleyrand informed Turreau of his position in regard to the western boundary of Louisiana. The Americans must not extend their pretensions too far, for they had acquired the territory on the same terms as France. Turreau's task was to preserve harmony between the two contending nations. This was the only interest of France in the boundary question. The United States ought not to claim the settlements of New Mexico nor the country towards the Northwest. Between these regions and Louisiana they should leave an intervening desert region and should follow natural limits, wherever possible. The French government had no intention of intervening in the matter but simply wished the American as its successor, to know what plan it had proposed to follow.¹⁶

With such intimations, to use no stronger term, from the French and Spanish ministers at Washington, and with dispatches of a similar tenor from Armstrong, Jefferson began by March to doubt the possibility of Monroe's success. He still hoped to secure the privilege of navigating the Mobile and an agreement to maintain the *status quo* elsewhere.¹⁷ Both he and Madison derived some comfort from the fact that Talleyrand had not openly declared against them in regard to the western limits of Louisiana, but as

¹⁶Talleyrand to Turreau, February 3, 1805. *Adams Transcripts, French State Papers*, Vol. III.

¹⁷Adams, II, 54, 55. Merry's dispatch No. 10 shows that Jefferson had little confidence in French support but trusted to gain his ends because of Spain's necessities. *Loc. cit.* Merry to Harrowby, March 4, 1805.

we have seen, they had no reason to believe that the French Secretary would support them even upon this point.¹⁸ The dispatches of the English minister, Merry, show this much more clearly than the President's own communications.

After Monroe reached Madrid he found that the Spanish court had taken up its temporary residence at Aranjuez and thither he and Pinckney determined to conduct their negotiation. Monroe had quickly determined to associate the latter with himself so far as signing the formal notes was concerned, but that he should personally conduct all interviews with the Spanish ministers. After reviewing Pinckney's course he came to the conclusion that the latter had taken a justifiable attitude towards Spain the previous summer and that he should participate in the present negotiation, as far as would serve its main purpose.¹⁹ The Spanish officials acquiesced in this arrangement with suspicious complacency, and accordingly, after the necessary formalities of presentation, the two American diplomats sent their first note to Cevallos.

After reviewing the subject of commercial claims they passed to a consideration of the boundaries of Louisiana. As a basis for a compromise they suggested that the American desire to possess the Floridas might be balanced by the Spanish desire to retard the western progress of the United States. At that very time the Florida frontier was in a state of jealous watchfulness that portended serious outbreaks, and this situation would soon be paralleled along the western border. It was possible to remove this condition, so provocative of misunderstanding, by the cession of the Floridas and the establishment of the western boundary upon just principles. The United States claimed to the Bravo, but if Spain ceded her territory east of the Mississippi, for which the United States would assume certain commercial claims, the latter agreed to form a neutral territory in the western part of Louisiana. The negotiators then followed their discussion with the project for a treaty covering these two main propositions.²⁰

After submitting this joint note Monroe made a personal call on the Prince of the Peace. He found that Godoy wished to refer the

¹⁸Ford, *Writings of Jefferson*, VIII, 349, 350; *Am. State Papers, For. Rel.*, II, 633.

¹⁹Monroe to Madison, January 19, 1805. *Spanish Despatches*, VII. MSS., Bureau of Indexes and Archives.

²⁰*Am. State Papers, For. Rel.*, II, 637, *et seq.*

question of limits to France. Monroe claimed that we had bought the right and title of that power, who had no further concern in the affair, and that as neighbors Spain and the United States should settle the question of boundaries for themselves. It is needless to observe that his contention would have been otherwise, had he believed that France would support him. He attempted to arouse Godoy, upon whose decision he believed the question to rest, by mentioning possible hostilities in case of a diplomatic rupture, but his opponent countered by referring to previous instances of British and French hostility against the United States. Monroe then essayed to tempt him by suggesting that his government would exercise greater restraint upon its western citizens, if the Florida cession were made, but this bribe was as little successful as his previous threat.²¹

Cevallos, the Spanish Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, was supposed to direct this negotiation for the Spaniards. In keeping with his superior's policy of diplomatic bluffing, he suggested that the Marqués de Casa Calvo, with a complete retinue, was then awaiting at New Orleans the arrival of American commissioners for the purpose of determining the true limits of Louisiana. All territorial questions should be deferred until this joint commission made its report. He then proceeded to discuss the subject of commercial claims,²² and this procedure caused Monroe to record in his *Journal* his belief that Cevallos only sought to delay the negotiation. He wrote to Madison that while some circumstances connected with the negotiation were so discouraging that it was impossible for him to predict the outcome, yet he believed that the Spaniards recognized the strength of the American position "with due discernment." Unfortunately for him and his colleague they did. In their reply to Cevallos, the Americans observed that boundary commissioners could do nothing until their respective governments determined the principle to guide them. It was an important part of their negotiation to fix that principle.²³

The first half of February passed without any progress in the negotiation. The Americans had fully opened up the discussion

²¹Monroe's "Journal of the Negotiations at Aranjuez," MSS., *Spanish Notes*, Vol. VIII, Bureau of Indexes and Archives.

²²*Am. State Papers, For. Rel.*, II, 640.

²³*Ibid.*, II, 641; *Spanish Despatches*, VIII.

from their standpoint, and thought that the Spaniards should give an immediate answer to each proposition advanced. Instead Cevallos discussed the Mobile Act, paid his respects to those who were responsible for the furore over suspending the deposit at New Orleans, and applied to West Florida the Spanish interpretation of the confusing three clauses in the Treaty of San Idelfonso. In protesting against this delay, Monroe and his colleague formally requested Cevallos to give them a definite statement in regard to the boundaries of Louisiana and a possible neutral zone, and they both sent long letters detailing their lack of success to their home government and to the American minister in Paris. At the same time Monroe showed his distrust of Armstrong by writing to his friend Skipwith, and charging him to watch the situation at the French court, but to keep the other from knowing of his action. To both he directed requests for maps and papers to be used in discussing the western boundary. He had expected to obtain them in Madrid but had not found anything of value. In his letters to Armstrong he vacillated between an independent policy that should cause European nations to respect the United States and a willingness to gain French support by some minor concessions in regard to commercial claims and the western boundary. He intimated that the administration was willing to prolong the period during which the territory between the Colorado and the Bravo was to remain neutral, or even to make the Colorado the permanent boundary. These terms, however, were not to be divulged to the French authorities, unless it was absolutely necessary, and they must not be permitted to dictate. Manifestly he could hope to gain nothing from such a one-sided offer, but his uncertain course and his failure to break off the negotiation at one or two critical points did as little to strengthen his cause in either place.²⁴

In his interview with Godoy on February 16, Monroe asked if Spain would cede the Floridas. The other replied in the affirmative, provided there should be an equivalent cession west of the Mississippi, but he did not wish to assume the responsibility of arranging for this. Godoy suggested that river as an excellent natural boundary, but Monroe insisted upon the Colorado. The other thought this came too near their Mexican settlements and believed

²⁴"Letters to and from Monroe," February 10, February 15, March 1, 1805. MSS., Lenox Branch, N. Y. Public Library; *Spanish Despatches*, VIII; *Am. State Papers, For. Rel.*, II, 641-644.

that the Americans should have nothing west of the Red. He seemed fearful that the presence of the Americans in the Floridas would facilitate attacks upon their other colonies. Monroe showed him that our presence in Louisiana already gave us this opportunity, but tried to reassure him by repeating his statement that if our government gained Florida by friendly negotiation it would be inclined to restrain its citizens and others from attacking our neighbors. Godoy then spoke of the many years that must elapse before the western portion could be settled and in an indefinite way mentioned the interest of Spain and the United States to keep Great Britain and France out of South America. For some reason Monroe felt encouraged by this interview.²⁵

On that day Cevallos dated a note for the American negotiators, but did not send it. In the course of this he stated that the representatives of each government should first discuss their respective rights upon the points at issue and then proceed to such negotiations as were convenient to both. This opened the way to an interminable discussion with no prospect of reaching a definite conclusion—precisely what Cevallos desired. Even this concession was not gained until the Americans, on the 18th, curtly informed him that they interpreted his silence as a wish to terminate the negotiation. Monroe reinforced his note by an audience that lasted for four hours, after which Cevallos sent his reply bearing the date of the 16th. In the course of this Cevallos stated that he considered the American claim to the Bravo as absolutely devoid of authority. These two interviews influenced Monroe to suggest the concession that he mentioned on February 26th in his letter to Armstrong.²⁶

By the middle of March Monroe lost his patience. They had now discussed every subject connected with the negotiation except the western boundary of Louisiana, and he and Pinckney insisted that Cevallos should reply upon that. Despite their urgency, the minister kept them waiting for nearly a month longer. A personal interview on April 5 failed to elicit any definite date for his reply. Cevallos, who claimed to be studying the subject of the western boundary of Louisiana, thought that his government would probably cede its territory east of the Mississippi for an equivalent in the

²⁵"Monroe's Journal," February 16, 1805. *Spanish Despatches*, VIII.

²⁶*Am. State Papers, For. Rel.*, II, 644; *Spanish Despatches*, VIII.

opposite quarter. His refusal to give a definite reply in regard to other points at issue and to let the western boundary go for the present, his insistence upon the fruitless West Florida discussion, while neglecting to make any statement in regard to the other territorial questions, led Monroe to think that he was simply amusing them by a pretense at negotiation. On the 9th of April the Americans intimate that they ought to terminate the discussion at once, but they weakly add that they are ready to renew it, if there is any prospect for a successful conclusion. Four days later, after vigorously protesting that he lacked time for a complete memoir, Cevallos submitted a résumé of Spanish claims to territory west of the Mississippi.²⁷ The Americans had now lost a favorable opportunity to break off the negotiation with credit to themselves. The main purpose of their mission was to secure the Floridas, and by March 12th they knew that the Spanish government would never cede them upon any terms they could accept. To bring up at this time a forced discussion of the western limits was to court additional mortification for themselves.

Monroe's *Journal* and his letters during this trying period abundantly show his uncertainty. On March 7th he wrote Armstrong that if they allowed the French government to dictate in regard to the eastern boundary of Louisiana, it might adopt the same policy in the north and west and thus reduce their acquisition to a nullity. They must reject Talleyrand as an arbiter.²⁸ But as the days passed with no proposition from Cevallos, with no word from Armstrong, and with no new instructions from Washington, he wondered if he ought to assume so decisive a tone. Casa Yrujo had probably assured his government that the American people would never fight for desert territory or old claims. The outcome of the whole negotiation rested with the French government and he believed that thoroughly corrupt motives then dictated its policy. He did not know what position it would take upon the western boundary, but it had supported the Spanish government on every other point and would probably do so on that. He might continue his present policy of acting without the assistance of France (as he strives to persuade himself that he is doing), or he could appeal to the cupidity or fear of that government. The lat-

²⁷*Ibid.*, 658-662.

²⁸*Ibid.*, 660 *et seq.*

ter motive would probably have little weight, for American commerce was too thoroughly exposed to French confiscation. If they should tempt French cupidity in the case of the Floridas, they might later have to employ the same means in settling the western boundary. So he thought it would be safer to continue the negotiation and attempt single-handed to extort from Spain some statement on this important subject.

The Spanish authorities had hardly begun to assemble their vast documentary stores relating to the Texas-Louisiana boundary, so Cevallos probably had little definite knowledge to guide him in the hastily prepared memoir that he submitted. He reviewed the rights of Spain, based upon the early *entradas* in Texas, and claimed that the pretensions of the United States were founded upon irresponsible French voyages and explorations, and the grant of Louis XIV to Crozat. This grant had never been acknowledged by Spain. After this general review of their respective claims he expressed his idea of the extent of Texas, the crucial area in determining the western limits of Louisiana. In this he closely follows the *dictum* of Talleyrand. The advanced settlements of each nation were Natchitoches and Adaes; therefore the dividing line between Louisiana and Texas should run southward to the gulf, between these two places, following the watershed that separated the Calcasieu and the Mermentou. To the north, beyond the Red River, the boundary was wholly uncertain and commissioners should be appointed by each nation to present their respective claims and effect a final settlement. Spain had already appointed her commissioners, who were at New Orleans awaiting similar action by the United States.

Monroe was disappointed both in the character and content of the memoir that he had finally wrung from the reluctant Cevallos. The brief historical review of Spanish claims to Texas had left him more firmly convinced than ever of the strength, if not the justice, of the American claim to the same region. On the other hand, he had expected from Cevallos some definite propositions that might form the basis for a treaty and he was uncertain whether to demand such or answer the other's arguments. His definite move, however, was to ask for the recall of Casa Yrujo, and he did this with the greater pleasure, for he thought that the Spanish minister, by emphasizing the peaceful dispositions of the American peo-

ple, was largely responsible for the apparent obstinacy of the Spanish government. Afterward he wrote Godoy, then at Madrid, concerning his last interview with Cevallos, although the other probably already knew of this from his own subordinates. Monroe perceived a reasonable excuse for answering the Spaniard's note in the fact that in his communication of April 13th, Cevallos had complained of some reflections on his character by the Americans and requested an explanation. A refusal to answer would imply that they lacked diplomatic courtesy, and while explaining this point they could take advantage of the occasion to express in greater detail their views on the western boundary. This action might favor their desire to obtain the definite proposals from Cevallos, for which they had thus far vainly sought.

In addition to the above reason for prolonging the negotiation, Monroe did not forget possible French interests. He knew that that government would not support him upon the other points at issue, but in view of its silence concerning the western boundary, he thought there could be no impropriety in the United States insisting upon its assumed rights. If the honor of France were untouched that nation might acquiesce in a final adjustment that would be unfavorable to Spain. If Talleyrand had any personal motive in the position that he assumed, he believed that it concerned those points upon which he had already expressed himself; so Spain might lose French support upon the western boundary and be compelled to yield elsewhere to regain its advantage. This would be a just punishment for Cevallos, in view of the course he had pursued in the negotiation.²⁹ Despite the faint hope suggested by this reasoning, Monroe reported to Armstrong that he saw little prospect for success at Aranjuez, for Spain was still wedded to the policy of Charles V, while her ally, France, hoped to convert the whole transaction into a species of jobbery.³⁰ Yet the European situation did not favor a rupture in the negotiation, so Monroe and his colleague determined to answer Cevallos's memoir on the western boundary.

In the note which they submitted to him on April 20, they laid down three general principles for determining the limits of European colonies. In this they simply followed the lead of Jefferson. By the first of these principles the possession of a portion of un-

²⁹*Spanish Despatches*, VIII.

³⁰*Ibid.*, VIII.

claimed sea coast gave to a nation the exclusive right to the drainage areas of all rivers emptying into the sea within that region. Under this principle, by virtue of the explorations of Joliet, Marquette, and La Salle they claimed the whole of the Mississippi Valley.

The second principle concerned the possession by two nations of the same sea coast at points not far apart. In such a case a middle point became the boundary. The Americans interpreted this principle to favor their claim to the Rio Grande. At the time when La Salle planted his colony at San Bernardo Bay the nearest Spanish settlement was at the mouth of the Panuco River. Consequently the Bravo, or Rio Grande, the most prominent half-way point, then became the boundary between the French and Spanish possessions. In this they likewise repeat the ideas of Jefferson.

The third principle laid down by the American diplomats was to the effect that when one European nation had acquired a right to any territory upon this continent, no other nation could diminish or affect this right by purchases, grants, or conquests from the natives within its limits. In other words, the Indian had no rights that the white man was bound to respect. In this they touched upon the territorial principle that Spain had followed, but drew an erroneous conclusion from it. They argued that the various costly *entradas* into Texas, the mission and presidial foundations of a century, the scattered *ranchos*, and a formally organized municipality, none of which rested upon formal treaties with the Indians, were simply evidences of French toleration and as such gave Spain no legal right to Texas against the claims of the United States. They attempted to bolster this universal disclaimer of Spanish occupation by stating that if the contrary were true any nation could now enter New Mexico and act in a similar manner toward the Indians there. We must absolve Monroe from any suggestion of malice in giving this example, but in view of the reports Cevallos was then receiving from that very region, it probably had the force of the traditional red rag.

In addition to announcing these principles, laboriously copied from their superior, Monroe and his associate likewise presented a modest group of authorities in support of their claim. The works of Champigny, Vergennes, and Le Page du Pratz, and the maps of Lopez and DeLisle do not form a very imposing list, nor did

they avail to convince Cevallos. Evidently Monroe's request to Skipwith and to Armstrong had not procured much material from Paris, or else the negotiators were unable to use it without previous instructions from home. They did, however, touch upon a very practical but obvious point, when they stated that it was important to settle the whole series of questions in some way, while the country on both sides of the Mississippi still remained largely unoccupied.³¹

Such, however, was not to be the case. Undoubtedly the Americans were stretching their three principles too far when by virtue of a few scattered French settlements, they attempted to include in the scope of their claims all the territory from the Rio Grande to the Canadian border. On the other hand, the Spanish occupation of Texas, while relatively more thorough than the French occupation of Louisiana, was not complete enough to justify a rigid insistence upon their claim to Adaes. Had Cevallos been in a humor to negotiate, or the French authorities to support the Americans, they might have reached some compromise on this and the other questions at issue not radically different from the treaty fourteen years later.

Monroe and Pinckney again experienced a tiresome period of waiting. The Spanish ministers of state, secure in French support, neither invited other propositions nor neglected Monroe's forced conferences. Buoyed up by the hope of French and Spanish success over the English blockading fleets (for Talfalgar had not yet occurred), Godoy exhibited no alarm at Monroe's suggestion that the Americans might prove disagreeable neighbors, unless he took measures to secure their good will. Beurnonville, the French ambassador, generally avoided Monroe, although he assured the latter that he had missed the opportunity to secure his ends by not coming to Madrid the previous year. On May 8th Cevallos told Monroe that he was preparing a memoir on the western limits of Louisiana, but that it would not be ready very soon, nor was he certain that it would contain any definite proposals for a treaty. The other's protests against further delay were unavailing. Godoy, when interviewed, simply told him that discussion was necessary and that time so employed was not lost. It is no wonder that the exasperated dip-

³¹*Am. State Papers, For. Rel.*, II, 662-665.

lomat wrote to Madison that he could "give no idea of the vexation of the whole affair."²²

Despite the delay and vexation that they had so far vainly experienced the Americans determined to make one more effort to secure adjustment. Nearly three weeks had passed with no formal reply from Cevallos to their note of April 20, when on May 9, Monroe requested an interview for the purpose of submitting final propositions. It is true he was further weakening his position by offering to submit new terms before the previous ones were definitely rejected, but Monroe believed this was the only course to take. If his propositions were accepted a treaty would follow; if rejected, the negotiation would be at an end.

On May 11th, according to appointment, he called to present these propositions. They involved the submission of part of the American commercial claims to arbitration and the relinquishment of others and of their claim to West Florida, provided that that territory and the rest of the Floridas should be ceded to them. Furthermore, the Americans agreed to make the Colorado the western boundary, with or without a strip of neutral territory, as Spain preferred. Cevallos quickly replied that there was no recompense for Spain in these proposals. That power would never pay a *sou* on the commercial spoliations, did not acknowledge that the United States had any claim whatever to West Florida, and did not regard the proposed western limit as a concession. Monroe had not intended to do more than submit his propositions without comment, but this "high tone and pre-emptory manner" forced him to reply with equal spirit. The concession that he offered in the West, he told Cevallos, was worth more than the whole territory east of the Mississippi. The American people would never relinquish a foot of land east of the Bravo, except for some equivalent. Our commercial claims must be settled in some way and the method proposed was the most honorable for Spain. But the obdurate Cevallos simply repeated his previous statements. Monroe then asked him if that was the answer of his government; because, if so, the negotiation was at an end. Cevallos told him to put his propositions into writing and he would then give him an answer. Full of foreboding, the Americans did so on the following day, and also sent copies to

²²*Spanish Despatches*, VIII.

Godoy, to make sure that both Spaniards thoroughly understood them.³³

Monroe believed that nothing would be done in reference to the negotiation except possibly through fear—a fear that would equally impress France and Spain. Unfortunately both nations believed the United States absolutely wedded to a peace policy. He rather expected Cevallos to send him another long memoir on the western limits, for the Spaniard had mentioned that he should send to Madrid and later to Mexico for documents. Such a course of examination would consume years of time, as was actually the case when the work was seriously undertaken. But Cevallos for once did not delay his answer. On May 15th he sent a curt note rejecting the American propositions and reiterating his previous position in regard to the commercial claims, West Florida, and the western boundary. This reply had the expected effect of bring the negotiation to an abrupt close. Six days later Monroe took formal leave of His Majesty.³⁴

In his dispatch of May 22, Pinckney summarized the negotiation from the preceding February. He stated that in Cevallos' position on the western boundary, he saw the grasping hand of Talleyrand, moved directly by Napoleon. Those men wished to be thrice paid for the territory west of the Mississippi. Once as they had already been, when the United States acquired Louisiana. In the second place by Spain, as that power was now doing to save West Florida and Texas. In the third place, when they should sell the Floridas to us, as they had already proposed to do, at a price comparable to that paid for Louisiana. In this as in the other cases France alone was to profit.³⁵ In their joint note of the following day the diplomats dwelt upon the reasonableness of their claim to the Bravo—the ostensible object that broke up the negotiation. In their view this was as well founded as that of Spain to any vacant portion of Mexico.³⁶

One can hardly say that Monroe and Pinckney conducted the negotiation in a manner to enhance their own or their nation's credit. They had attempted to force from an unwilling opponent certain concessions based on extravagant commercial and terri-

³³*Ibid.*

³⁴*Am. State Papers, For. Rel.*, II, 667.

³⁵*Spanish Despatches*, VI.

³⁶*Am. State Papers, For. Rel.*, II, 667-669.

torial claims and then had weakly offered to surrender the most significant of these. They had assumed that they were acting independently of any other nation, but were using every effort to attract French support and insisting that every phase of the negotiations should be submitted to the French Cabinet. Even in this affair Monroe did not work in conjunction with Armstrong, but continually directed his friend Skipwith to spy upon the latter's actions. Armstrong's letters, however, show that he was doing his best to reach Napoleon through Joseph Bonaparte and thus check the sinister influence of Talleyrand. In after years Monroe charged Armstrong with interest in a scheme for speculation in Texas lands and professed to believe that for this reason the other wished the negotiation transferred to Paris; but the evidence for this is not convincing.³⁷ French hostility alone, from whatever motive, would account for the failure of the negotiation. A more forceful diplomat than Monroe would have realized this much sooner and retired from an embarrassing situation.

In their suggestions to the administration at home the negotiators apparently tried to make amends for the nerveless way in which they had thus far conducted affairs. They advocated the seizure of the territory they claimed, that is, both West Florida and Texas, and in addition East Florida, as compensation for commercial damages. They should dismantle the Spanish posts within the disputed area and then treat with aggrieved Spain. This would permit France to withdraw from the situation with honor. The apparent vigor of this policy may be greatly discounted. Armstrong had already informed Monroe that Talleyrand had told him that France would make common cause with Spain. Moreover, in a letter which Monroe had just received from Paris, Armstrong told him that France was using the whole matter to her own advantage. Spain and the United States were like two oranges that Napoleon was squeezing together and the one that yielded the more would be less harmed. He advised that the United States abandon the West Florida contention and the commercial claims and seize Texas. Napoleon had once ordered his subordinates to occupy this province as part of Louisiana, so he could not well object to this course, nor with his European entanglements was he likely to do so. Thus they might secure a definite diplomatic settlement. The proposal of

³⁷Monroe to Skipwith, July 31, 1823. Lenox. MSS.

the others, then, to seize the Floridas as well as Texas, may be due to Monroe's jealousy of Armstrong, which would lead him to suggest a somewhat different course. Yet, in July, when he passed through Paris on his way to London, he unconditionally approved the other's suggestion.³⁸ Thus the Virginian a second time followed the lead of a New Yorker in the tangled diplomacy of the Louisiana Purchase, but their executive was not ready to accept such vigorous advice. Had Jefferson done so he would have avoided one of the most dishonorable diplomatic entanglements of our history. But the Texas question was not to be so quickly settled, nor was American diplomatic stock to rise in Europe until it had sunk to a much lower level.

³⁸*Spanish Despatches*, VIII. Monroe and Pinckney to Madison, May 22 and May 25, 1805; *Spanish Despatches*, VII, Monroe to Madison, June 30, 1805; Armstrong to Monroe, May 4, 1805. "*Letters to Monroe*" (Lenox), 1804-05.

CORRESPONDENCE FROM THE BRITISH ARCHIVES
CONCERNING TEXAS, 1837-1846

VIII

EDITED BY EPHRIAM DOUGLASS ADAMS

KENNEDY TO ABERDEEN¹


Private.

British Consulate

Galveston—August 6th. 1843.

My Lord,

The information which I have the honor to submit to Your Lordship has been tendered to me by a party concerned in the transactions to which it refers, upon the condition that I would not Communicate it to any person now resident in Texas.



The facts set forth in documents placed before me relate to the islands of Cozumel and Mugerres, or "Mohair," situated on the coast of Yucatan, and claimed as part of the territory of Mexico, but they bear more closely and immediately upon Cozumel, than upon Mugerres.—Subjoined is a rude outline of the form of Cozumel, with Sections marked for first, second, and third "choice."

¹F. O., Texas, Vol. 7.

On his first expedition against Mexico, Cortes touched at Cozumel, then an inhabited island, and the ruins of buildings erected by that Commander are said to be still visible on its E. N. E. portion.—Its length is estimated at about ten leagues—its breadth at the widest part, about five, and it is distant about fifteen Miles from the Mainland.

The outside, or Eastern, coast of Cozumel is represented as iron-bound and inaccessible; the Southern and Western sides are said to have a firm, accessible beach, with deep and tranquil water, where "Vessels of any draft may anchor, within a Cable's length of the Shore".— About three leagues from the Southern most point of the Island, lies "a fine Bay, well land-locked, having deep water inside, with a bar of nine feet water, at the entrance." The whole Coast abounds in fresh water springs. The larger division, towards the South, is "completely covered" with a dense mass of valuable forest timber, and brushwood. The lesser division, towards the North, consists of "low Marshy ground mixed with small lagoons." The arable land is a rich, West Indian Soil, "suitable," (says an agent sent to examine it)—for the Culture of Sugar, Coffee, Cotton, &c. in a fairly healthy climate, where frost is never known and every inch of ground is covered with thick forest of the tallest trees, among them, Teak, Cedar, and dye stuffs,—with two excellent harbours, "Brutus Cove," and "Port Thomson."

Easy to be defended and offering many advantages for Shipping, Cozumel is said to be well adapted for the establishment of a Commercial Nation; possessing local facilities for supplying Southern Mexico, the Bay of Honduras and Colombia, and, in a measure, commanding the passage between Yucatan and Cuba.

On Arrowsmith's Map of Mexico, Cozumel is placed about two hundred Miles North from the Capital of the British settlement at Honduras, and about fifty Miles South from the little island of Mugerres.

Mugerres, which is estimated to be about three leagues in length, possesses hardly any agricultural value being chiefly composed of sand, but it is said to Command a harbour of ample extent and great security, having "not less than three and a half fathoms of water at the entrance." A Vessel, once inside, cannot well be discovered, "the land surrounding the Bay, or Harbour, being high

enough to hide a Ship's Masts".—It has been commended by the French as "a most desirable Naval Station," and the Texan Commander (Moore) thus writes concerning it, in a letter dated Sisal de Yucatan, 20th January, 1842.

—————"I have had the island and harbour of Mugerres examined, and have sent a Chart of the Harbour to the Navy Department. (of Texas) It is an excellent Harbour, but there is very little good land, and scarcely any heavy timber on it. Before I return to Texas, I will examine the island of Cozumel myself."

Cozumel, which contained an Indian population, when visited by Cortes, appears to have been long abandoned by its ancient inhabitants, whose fields have been overrun by the rank and rapid vegetation of a tropical Country.—Within the last few years, it has become the object of Speculating, and, perhaps, political cupidity in this quarter.

In 1837, it was visited by two Texan Privateers named the "Brutus" and the "Invincible." At that time, it contained no Settled inhabitants. Some Indians who had crossed from the mainland in Canoes, were employed in catching turtle. "They had no knowledge of to whom the island might belong." The Texan privateers, or "Men of War," as they have been styled, took a nominal possession of the place, hoisting their flag, and commissioning Indians as representatives. When the privateers returned to Texas, they reported their proceedings to the Government, but the matter, with the view, as it would seem, to speculation, was not allowed to transpire.

In 1840, a project was devised, under the auspices of some leading Members of the (then) Texan Government, to open a way to the future occupation of the island. Taking advantage of dissension between Yucatan and Mexico, a plan was formed for its purchase by some Citizens of Texas, who proposed to offer their Government a rendezvous for its Navy; to encourage emigration, and, ultimately, when fit opportunity arose, to claim the right of self-government under Texan protection.—A Mr. Robinson, formerly United States Consul at Tampico, with certain associates, agreed to bring some hundreds of emigrants from New York, and to pay the Yucatan Government the sum of \$100,000 (dollars) within three Months from the date of the contract. Owing to

the pecuniary embarrassments of the Married friends of these parties at New York, this project fell to the ground.

An agricultural establishment had been made upon Cozumel in the year 1838, by the Governor of Yucatan, the first Alcalde of Merida, and Colonel Peraza, a man of influence among the Yucatanians. They engaged in the cultivation of Cotton, sent to their plantation about thirty debtors and criminals taken from the prison of the City of Merida, and confided the Superintendence of the business, with a share of the profits, to Vicente Alvino a Spaniard well acquainted with the locality, and who had been navigating many years as a *Contrabandista* between Belize and Sisal.

In 1841 Colonel Peraza, then on a Mission from Yucatan to Texas, when passing through New Orleans, was requested to co-operate with a Military officer of Texas who hoped to succeed in organizing a Company in Tennessee, for the purchase of a large part of the island of Cozumel. The documents before me State that Colonel Peraza pledged himself to favour this individual "all that he could."

The State of Yucatan embroiled with the general Government of Mexico, and, pressed for resources, issued a Law on the 5th of April, 1841, relative to the Sale and Conveyance of its vacant lands. On the 14th of October 1841, a Company was formed at Galveston, to purchase a portion of Cozumel, under the provisions of this Law. The first associates were three in number, and there were five others who were to have the privilege of joining them, if they came forward with funds "in good time." Among the five were the Commodore of the Texan Navy and two officers of rank in the regular service of Texas.

One of the three original associates who had been Collector of Customs at Galveston, under the Mexican Government, was furnished with Money and instructions, and sent to Galveston, where he arrived in November 1841. He was Commissioned, in the first instance, to purchase two Square leagues of land in the island of Cozumel, proceeding according to the designated order of selection already shown in outline. With the sanction of the local Authorities, he surveyed six Square leagues of land, and assured his associates that, "with sufficient powers of attorney and funds in hand," he could, "from time to time, acquire the whole island *gradually*,

but not at once, in order to avoid suspicion." In consequence of the failure of the New Orleans Banks, the necessary means was not forthcoming, and the agent, who seems to have been a person of considerable acuteness, but not over wise in his moral perceptions, returned to Galveston in July 1842, after an absence of Nine Months, transmitting to his associates "A contract and detailed Map of Survey of Six Leagues of land on the island of Cozumel, and Translations of Official documents accrediting the location, survey, and purchase of the said land, and the Sale by the Government of Yucatan confirmed, and the titles ready to issue whenever the provisions of the law upon the subject, as set forth in the said official Communication, are complied with."

It is alleged that the right of pre-emption yet remains with the parties for whom the agent selected the six leagues of land

I now come to the last point in the proceedings respecting Cozumel, according to the information placed before me.

I am assured that the *quiet* occupation of the Island, by the path already opened, was suggested to M. de Saligny, Chargé d' Affaires of France in Texas, who is at present in Europe, by whom, it is alleged, the proposition was seriously entertained

Whatever may be the value of the present Communication, I have deemed it my duty to transmit it to Your Lordship, for the following reasons

1st. That—I believe the facts, as I have stated them, to be substantially true.

2nd. That—Americans are quick in discerning local advantages, and persevering in the endeavour to turn them to their own account.

3rd. That—The Government of Mexico, having been baffled in its attempts to reduce Yucatan to obedience, the latter state may be so far free to exercise an independent prerogative as to transfer its vacant lands to Foreigners for a trifling consideration

4th.—That desirous of insular aggrandizement, France might be willing to secure an early hold on a position near to Mexico, within a short sail of the British Settlement of Honduras, and not remote from the Isthmus of Panama.

5th. That—Without presuming to attach any special importance to the transactions under review, it is, at all events, the more prudent course to report them to Your Lordship.

William Kennedy.

The Earl of Aberdeen, K. T.

ABERDEEN TO ELLIOTT.²

Draft.

F. O. August 18, 1843

Captain Elliot.

No. 10.³

Sir,

Your Despatches to No. 20 inclusive, with the exception of No. 13, have been received and laid before the Queen.

With reference to my Despatch No. 6, of the 3rd of June last, relative to the proposals made to Texas by Genl Santa Anna for the Settlement of the Contest between Texas and Mexico, I have to transmit to you herewith for your information, a Copy of a Despatch which I addressed to Mr. Doyle, Her Majesty's Chargé d' Affaires in Mexico, on the 1st Ulto, upon the same subject.⁴

KENNEDY TO ABERDEEN⁵

Private.

British Consulate.

Galveston August 22d. 1843.

My Lord.

I beg leave to transmit to Your Lordship a printed Article which I have extracted from the "New Orleans Bulletin" of Thursday, August 10th. It has been the Subject of Comment in this place.

By Statements in the London Newspapers recently received here, it would seem that parties in England entertain the impression that the people of this Country are willing to treat for the emancipation of their Slaves. I have been, and am, endeavouring to ascertain how far the impression is warranted by facts,—before I transmit a reply to the Queries contained in Your Lordship's Despatch marked "*Sc Te No. 1,*" and dated May 30th, 1843.

William Kennedy.

The Earl of Aberdeen K. T.

²F. O., Texas, Vol. 6. The letter is unsigned.

³F. O., Texas, 19. Aberdeen to Elliot, No. 8, June 19, and No. 9, July 3, 1843, have been omitted. The first referred to the land claims of Cotesworth, Powell, and others; the second transmitted copies of correspondence with Doyle, in Mexico, relative to the threatened treatment of all foreigners found in Texas when Mexico should reconquer that territory.

⁴F. O., Mexico, 169. Aberdeen to Doyle, No. 10, July 1, 1843. Aberdeen urged larger concessions by Mexico, and also expressed the view that by making these, abolition in Texas might be secured. (Adams, *British Interests and Activities in Texas*, 130-131.) For a different view of Aberdeen's leading purpose, see Smith, *The Annexation of Texas*, 93.

⁵F. O., Texas, Vol. 7.

KENNEDY TO ABERDEEN⁶*Private.*

British Consulate.

Galveston August 23rd 1843

My Lord,

I have the honor to enclose a printed translation of the Land Law of the Mexican State of Yucatan, referred to in my despatch marked "Private" and dated the 6th Instant.

I hope soon to be enabled to transmit a Chart of the Harbour and Sketch of the Island of Mugerres, off the Yucatan Coast.

Information has been brought by the Texan War Vessels lately employed in aiding Yucatan, that the Government of that State had granted to American officers and Seamen, in their Service, the privilege of settling a certain portion of Vacant public land, and that the said officers and Seamen were making preparations,—when the Texan Vessels left Campeche—"to visit the island of *Cozumel*, and locate their Claims upon it."

William Kennedy.

The Earl of Aberdeen, K. T.

ELLIOTT TO ABERDEEN⁷No. 24⁸

Galveston August 23r. 1843

My Lord,

I avail myself of a short delay in the departure of the Steam Boat to New Orleans to report the return (last Evening) of the Texian Custom House Vessel which took back to Matamoros the Mexican Officer who had brought in General Woll's dispatches of the 16th Ultimo to this Government

Mr. I'. L. Giffard Her Majesty's Vice Consul at Matamoros went down from here to that place in the same vessel, and I learn by a Note from him dated on the 14th Instant that General Woll had assured him He would use his best efforts to induce the President of Mexico to release the remainder of the Texian prisoners. It does not appear to be determined whether the Commissioners for the arrangement of the Armistice are to meet at Laredo or at Matamoros, but it is probable that Matamoros may be preferred. They would meet about the 25th of next Month

⁶F. O., Texas, Vol. 7.⁷F. O., Texas, Vol. 6.⁸Elliot to Aberdeen, No. 23, of 1843, is missing from the archives.

I take the liberty of forwarding a Newspaper which will place Your Lordship in possession of all that has transpired respecting the result of the late attempts to obstruct the Santa Fé traders on their return to that place from Missouri. Your Lordship will remark that the order to the Texian Officer was dated on the 16th February last, that is, rather more than a Month before any prospect of Negotiation presented itself to this Government.

It appears probable that this interference of the Government of the United States in behalf of the Mexican traders would be pleaded in support of decided interference in behalf of Texas, in the event of a resumption of hostilities, and any recurrence of the incursionary Warfare of last year upon the part of Mexico against this Country.

Your Lordship's dispatches to No 9 inclusive have been received.

Charles Elliot.

The Earl of Aberdeen, K. T.

KENNEDY TO ABERDEEN⁹

Private.

British Consulate

Galveston, August 29th 1843

My Lord,

In a despatch marked "Private," and dated on the 23rd of the Month, I expressed a hope that I might "soon be enabled to transmit to Your Lordship a Chart of the Harbour and Sketch of the Island of Mugerres, off the Yucatan Coast.

Availing myself of the opportunity afforded by Her Majesty's Sloop of War "Scylla," which sails today from Galveston for Vera Cruz, I have the honor to forward a Map of the Island of Mugerres, with the Survey of the Coast and Harbour made by order of the Texan Commodore.

I have incurred an outlay of a few dollars in this Matter, which I propose to include under the head of "Consular Contingencies"

William Kennedy

P. S. The Map transmitted is enclosed in a tin case, and I have reserved another copy for transmission, should the one now sent by any accident fail to reach its destination

W. K.

The Earl of Aberdeen, K. T.

⁹F. O., Texas, Vol. 7.

ELLIOTT TO ABERDEEN¹⁰

No. 25.

Galveston September 5th
1843

My Lord,

I have the honor to report that Her Majesty's Sloop "Scylla" arrived here on the 28th Ultimo, bringing me a despatch from Her Majesty's Chargé d' Affaires at Mexico dated on the 15th Ultimo,¹¹ proposing on the part of General Santa Aña, an exchange of prisoners. The Inclosures are the Note¹² I addressed to this Government upon the subject, and my reply to Mr Doyle, but Mr Jones's answer will hardly reach me in time to be despatched by this opportunity.

The Scylla sailed to Tampico and Vera Cruz on the 29th Ultimo.

Affairs in this quarter remain in the situation reported in my last despatches. I may mention however that the elections for the next Session of Congress closed yesterday, and I believe it is generally considered that the result has been favorable to the Administration

Charles Elliot

To the Earl of Aberdeen. K. T.

ELLIOTT TO DOYLE¹³

[Enclosure].

Galveston. August 28th, 1843.

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge your despatch of the 15th Instant (received this morning) and in reply I beg leave to forward the copy of a note which I have addressed to this Government.¹⁴ In the absence of General Houston on the Upper Trinity at an Indian Council, from which he is not expected back for the next fortnight, and under the circumstances of the other claims on the Services of the "Scylla," I have not thought it right to request the

¹⁰F. O., Texas, Vol. 6.¹¹F. O., Texas, 23. Doyle to Elliott, August 15, 1843.¹²Elliott to Jones, August 28, 1843. In Garrison, *Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas*, III, 1123-1124, in *Am. Hist. Assoc. Report*, 1908, II.¹³F. O., Texas, Vol. 6.¹⁴See note 12, above.

Commander to remain 'till I can receive replies from Washington. She will therefore Sail again tomorrow.

Whilst I perceive no reason to doubt that General Houston will accede to General Santa Aña's proposal, I must beg it may be observed that I am speaking without authority, and must by no means be understood to commit him to that effect. The Mexican prisoners, however, are perfectly at large, and I am so sensible of General Houston's considerate dispositions toward them, that I am persuaded He would not offer the least objection to their return. It should be mentioned that many of them are engaged in profitable Employments, and it is possible some amongst them may prefer to remain by their property, more particularly under the hope that peace is about to be restored, and that they may have an opportunity of realizing it, and returning at their leisure.

It is very satisfactory to learn that the President of Mexico seems inclined to do whatever may be in his power, in the sense of conciliation, for the promotion of an honorable and lasting peace; and I am sure it may be depended upon, on the other hand, that this Government will cordially respond to those feelings.

Copy.

Charles Elliot.

Charles Elliot.

Percy W. Doyle Esqre.

H. M. Chargé d' Affaires
Mexico.

[Endorsed] Inclosure No 2 in Capt Elliot's despatch to The Earl of Aberdeen No 25. Sept. 5. 1843.

KENNEDY TO ABERDEEN¹⁵

Slave Trade.

British Consulate

No 4.

Galveston. Sept 5th. 1843

My Lord,

I have the honor to enclose a Return to Your Lordship's despatch marked "Slave Trade No. 1," and dated May 30th 1843.

In conformity with Your Lordship's instructions, I have endeavoured to make the reply to each question as concise as possi-

¹⁵F. O., Slave Trade, Vol. 479.

ble. Had Texas been an older Country, offering ampler materials for the return, some of the replies would have been more brief

The Earl of Aberdeen, K. T.

William Kennedy

[Enclosure.].

Republic of Texas.

Consulate of Galveston.

Return to a Despatch Marked, Slave Trade No. 1—dated May 30th. 1843

Query 1st. Answer. No Census of the Republic of Texas having yet been taken, it is impossible to state, with accuracy, the amount of its population, or the respective Numbers of Whites and of Coloured people forming that population. According to election and other returns, the White population may be estimated at 80,000 (eighty thousand) souls, the Indians at 12,000 (twelve thousand) and the Slaves at 16,000 (sixteen thousand). The free persons of Colour are extremely few.

It is to be observed that this estimated population is embraced within the limits that designated Texas as a department of Republican Mexico. The additional territory claimed by Texas since the Revolution, but neither occupied by her Settlers, nor held by her troops, contains a considerable Mexican and Indian population, for estimating whose numbers, there are no reliable data. By far the greater portion of this territory is waste.

There is no Registry of Slaves in Texas. An Act of Congress "to raise a Revenue by direct taxation," imposed a tax upon Slaves, and the Assessors appointed under the Act gave in returns for the year 1840, which produced the following result:—

Negro Slaves under 15 years of age.....	4,992
Over 15 and under 50.....	5,899
Over 50	332

Total11,223

There were no returns from nine (probably remote and thinly peopled) Counties.

Allowing for omitted and imperfect returns, the whole Slave population of Texas, at the close of the year 1840, may be set down, in round numbers, at 12,000 (twelve thousand). Owing

to her unsettled relations with Mexico, the amount of Slaves introduced into Texas, since 1840, especially by sea, cannot have been considerable nor is there any substantial ground for supposing that the entire Slave population of the Republic, including a late accession by the adjustment of the North Eastern boundary line with the United States, at present exceeds 16,000 (sixteen thousand) souls.

Population in 1832. By calculations chiefly based upon the Statistical Report of a Commission, employed by the Mexican Government, the population of the, then, Department of Texas, in the year 1832, may be estimated at about 20,000 (twenty thousand) Whites, 2,000 (two thousand) Negroes, and 15,000 (fifteen thousand) Indians.

Population in 1837. The Texan Revolution in 1835 had, on the one hand, the effect of breaking up Settlements and dispersing Slaves, and, on the other, of attracting a crowd of Military Adventurers and speculators from the United States. No good estimate can be formed of the amount of the population in the year 1837. It may be remarked that, at this period, there was no material decrease in the numbers of the Indians of Texas. In subsequent years, the Cherokees, and other tribes from the United States, were treated as intruders on the soil, and expelled from the Republic by force of Arms.

Query 2d. Answer.—Information, drawn from competent private sources, warrants the conclusion that, within the last ten years, no Slaves have been imported direct from Africa, and indeed, that no vessel from the African Coast has, of late years, entered a Port of Texas. It is confidently alleged that the following list includes nearly all the Slaves that have been imported from every quarter, with the exception of the United States, since the year 1833.

1835. In this year, the notorious Munroe Edwards and a partner named Christopher Dart purchased 183 Slaves in Havanna, Shipped them openly on board an American Schooner called the "Shanadoah," and landed them in Texas, at the river San Bernard, South of the Brazos, in the Neighbourhood of the Cotton plantations. These Slaves continued under the control of Edwards until 1838. A Mortgage had been executed to the factors at Havanna, to secure the payment of 35,000 dollars, the un-

liquidated balance of the purchase Money. Edwards endeavoured to avoid payment of this claim, and also refused to account to Dart for his interest in the purchase. The Slaves were placed under legal Sequestration, and Edwards filed a release from Dart for his share, which release proved to be a forgery. Edwards was arrested, but availing himself of enlargement on bail, he fled to the United States and passed from thence to England. By plausible representations and the use of fabricated letters of introduction, he succeeded in imposing on the friends of Negro Emancipation in both Countries. He is now imprisoned in New York, where he has been sentenced to undergo a long term of Confinement for swindling.—The Havanna firm, concerned as factors in the purchase of the Slaves for Edwards and Dart, have instituted legal proceedings in Texas for the recovery of the 35,000 dollars still owing to them, but, as yet, without effect.

In the same year (1835) 40 Slaves, Shipped at Cuba, on board the American Schooner Harriet, was landed at the river San Bernard.

1836. This year a Schooner (name unascertained) conveyed 40 Slaves from Cuba to the Port of Velasco, where part of them were landed, but a Collector of Customs being stationed at that Port, the Schooner was ordered off, and she landed the remainder at Caney Creek.

In the Autumn of the same year (1836) a Schooner under the Spanish flag, Commanded by one Moro, a Spaniard, and owned by a person named Coigly, born of American parents at Matanzas, and supposed to have carried 200 Slaves from Cuba, ran up the river Sabine, which divides the United States and Texas. It is not known, here, whether the Slaves were landed or not. There is a story that the owner, Coigly, who was on board, was murdered, and that the Spanish Master went off with Cargo and Schooner.

1837 and 1838. During these years, 41 Slaves, in two Shipments, were brought from Cuba and landed near the Brazos river, and thence distributed over the plantations

Excluding some persons of Colour, kidnapped from the British West India Islands, who do not belong to this classification, and who were claimed by the British Government, the total of ascer-

tained imports of Slaves into Texas, within the last ten years, from all places except the United States, Amounts to 504.

The fact that there were few or no persons in Texas possessing sufficient Capital to enable them to undertake the risk of the Voyage, is the reason assigned for there having been no direct importation of Slaves from Africa.

There are no means for ascertaining the annual amount of Slaves imported from the United States. With the exception of some purchased by Europeans at New Orleans, nearly all have been introduced by American immigrants. By Section 9th of the "General Provisions" of the Constitution of Texas, the admission, or importation, of Africans, or Negroes, into the Republic, except from the United States of America, is for ever prohibited, and declared to be piracy. The same section provides that—"Congress shall pass no laws to prohibit emigrants from bringing their Slaves into the Republic with them, and holding them by the same tenure by which such Slaves were held in the United States."

Query 3d. Answer. In criminal cases, the law does not extend either to the Slave, or to the free Man of Colour, the same protection that it yields to free White persons.—For example—a Slave, or free person of Colour, Convicted before a District Court of maiming a free White person, (which, in the case of Whites is punishable by fine and flagellation) incurs the penalty of death. By the same Act, it is provided that, for offences, not Capital, Slaves shall be tried before County Courts, at a special term to be immediately called, and "it shall not be necessary in such cases, that a bill be found by a Grand Jury, but the party shall be required to proceed to trial upon a charge made out and signed by the person holding the information, setting forth the offence, with which such Slave stands charged."—It is further provided by said Act, that—"if any Slave, or free person of Colour, shall use insulting, or abusive language to, or threaten any free White person, upon complaint thereof before any Justice of the peace, such Justice shall cause such Negro to be arrested, and, upon Conviction, the Slave, or free person of Colour, shall be punished by stripes, not exceeding one hundred, nor less than twenty-five.

Query 4th. Answer. The law enacts that if—"Any person shall unreasonably, or cruelly treat, or otherwise abuse, any Slave,

he, or she, shall be liable to be sued in any Court of Competent Jurisdiction, and on Conviction thereof, shall be fined in a Sum not less than 250, nor more than 2,000 dollars." It is further provided that—"if any person, or persons, shall Murder any Slave, or so cruelly treat the same as to cause death, the same shall be felony, and punished as in other cases of Murder." It is the duty of the District Judges to carry into effect the provisions of this law.

Query 5th. Answer. The evidence of a Slave is not received in Courts of law.

Query 6th. Answer. Opinion stigmatizes persons who maltreat their Slaves, and the general tendency is to feed them sufficiently, and to use them without rigour. Scanty fare and harsh treatment are generally confined to the Slaves of impoverished owners.

Query 7th Answer. The Negroes of Slaveholders in easy circumstances are considered to enjoy as good health, and to live as long as free persons, but it may well be supposed that this cannot be the case in regard to the Slaves of persons comparatively poor. Owing to the comparatively recent introduction of Slaves into Texas, there is no satisfactory test of their longevity. When the owners are poor, the dwellings of the Slaves will too often be insufficient to protect them from the variations of the Climate, which, in Winter, is cold even along the sea coast. The searching "Northers" cannot fail to operate keenly upon the African temperament, and to call for a supply of warm clothing, which insolvent owners are unable to afford. Nor are the Negroes on the low Alluvial lands that are subject to overflows exempt from the fevers peculiar to such localities. They suffer occasionally from attacks that require Medical remedies and care, and these, in a measure suited to their wants, their Masters are not always in a condition to provide.

Query 8th. Answer. The Slave population is annually increased by the introduction of Negroes from the United States, most of whom belong to immigrants—Owing to the unsettled state of the external relations of Texas, the increase has been comparatively small, and is chiefly exhibited in the Eastern Counties of the Republic. The Constitution declares that—"Congress shall pass no laws to prohibit emigrants from bringing their Slaves into

the Republic with them, and holding them by the same tenure by which such Slaves were held in the United States."

Query 9th Answer. The Manumission of Slaves is of rare occurrence.—Section 9th of the "General Provisions" of the Constitution of Texas has these words.—"Nor shall Congress have power to emancipate Slaves, nor shall any Slave-holder be allowed to emancipate his, or her, Slave or Slaves, without the consent of Congress, unless he, or she, shall send his, or her, Slave, or Slaves, without the limits of the Republic."

Query 10th Answer.—The laws and regulations have become—in, the letter—less favourable to Slaves since Texas obtained the position of an independent State. The real condition of the Negroes is little, if at all, affected thereby, as, during the period of Mexican supremacy, the laws for the mitigation of Slavery were virtually unenforced.

Query 11th Answer. There is no professed or recognized section of Citizens in Texas favourable to the Abolition of Slavery. Whatever concurrence of opinion may exist among individuals, it has not yet developed itself through open Association, public Meetings, or the agency of the press.

Query 12th Answer. The difference in the eye of the law between a free White and a free Coloured Man, is extreme. Some evidence of this difference has been given in the answer to the third Query.

The Constitution declares that—"No free person of African descent, either in whole or in part, shall be permitted to reside permanently in the Republic without the Consent of Congress."

An Act of Congress makes it unlawful for any free persons of Colour to emigrate to the Republic. Any person so emigrating is to be arrested, and required to give bail for 4,000 dollars with the security of an approved Citizen for his removal out of the Republic. If unable to comply with this requisition of the law, such person is to be committed to Jail, and, after Notice, to be sold into Slavery for the term of one year. During the year, he is open to liberation, on rendering the specified bond. Failing in this, he is to be returned to the Sheriff at the end of the term, to be by him sold, at public Auction, and—"Any such free person of Colour so sold, shall remain a Slave for life."—The same Act prohibits Owners and Masters of Vessels from bringing, or aiding in

bringing, free persons of Colour into the Republic, under a penalty varying between 1,000, and 10,000 dollars, with a reservation in favour of Ship Cooks and working hands.

Query 13th. Answer. Free Coloured Men have never been admitted to offices of the State.

Query 14th. Answer. No periodical Census has yet been taken of the population in the District of the Galveston Consulate.

William Kennedy.

Consul at Galveston

[Endorsed.] In Mr. Consul Kennedy's despatch of 5th September 1843.

KENNEDY TO ABERDEEN¹⁶

Private.

British Consulate.

Galveston. Sept. 6th. 1843.

My Lord,

In the return which I have had the honor to make to the questions in Your Lordship's despatch of 30th May, marked "Slave Trade No 1," I have stated that there is, in Texas, no recognized party favourable to the Abolition of Slavery.—This statement has been made with a full knowledge of the fact that, within the present year, certain proceedings have occurred, in this Section of the Republic, having reference to the emancipation of the Slaves.

Some idea of the character and local effect of these proceedings may be gleaned from Newspaper publications, of which I beg leave to enclose extracts.¹⁷

On or about the 18th of last March, a Mr Andrews, who has been about three Years resident in this Country, and who, I understand, has been in the legal profession, at the town of Hous-

¹⁶F. O., Slave Trade, Vol. 479.

¹⁷This and the preceding dispatch from Kennedy have been printed in British Sessional Papers, 1844, Commons, Vol. 49; *Slave Trade Correspondence*, Class C, pages 282-286. They are here reprinted as of unusual interest and not easily available. The eleven enclosures in Kennedy's letter of September 6 are newspaper cuttings for 1843, as follows: *Texas Times*, March 18; *Galveston Civilian*, April 1 and 29, August 9, 12 and 26; *New Orleans Republican*, July 3 and August 29; *Houston Telegraph*, August 22 (two cuttings) and August 30. These treat of the Andrews abolition movement and of the Yates-Converse correspondence, and are all printed in the volume of the British Sessional Papers just noted. The volume also contains much interesting material on the alleged violation of slave trade laws by a British firm, Frankland & Co. Other volumes of the Sessional Papers containing slave trade correspondence on Texas are 1845, Commons, Vol. 50, and 1846, Commons, Vol. 51.

ton, accompanied by a Mr. League, visited Galveston, and began, cautiously, to unfold a project of Slave emancipation. The supporters they found were not, it appeared, numerous; they were not permitted to develop publicly the object of their Mission; and, ultimately, Mr Andrews was forced, by the unlicensed interference of the populace, to enter a boat and proceed to the Mainland, under an injunction not to revisit the Island. His Colleague, Mr. League, quietly withdrew, without abiding the risk of ejection by a Mob. At this point, the agitation of the project of emancipation ceased in Galveston, and I am not aware that it has been again commenced in any other part of the Republic.

The last of the Newspaper extracts which I have taken leave to transmit (No. 11) is from the avowed and admitted organ of the President of the United States at New Orleans. To that Article I would respectfully invite Your Lordship's attention, as I am assured, by a party whose trustworthiness I have long known, that Materials for its Composition, and of others in a similar vein, were received from a "qualified" source at the City of Washington (U. S.). I am told that the suggestion of the "*New Orleans Republican*," recommendatory of the occupation of Texas by American troops, had (according to the writer from Washington) given "great satisfaction to the Secretary of State."—The Journalist was counselled to avoid political extremes, so that, by appealing to the interests of all Sections, unanimity of action might be secured "When the question of Annexation came before Congress in December next,—at which period it would be submitted to that body, in the President's Annual Message."

The New Orleans Journalist was farther advised to address the Southern interest on the topics most likely to stimulate—to expatiate, among other points, on the danger to be apprehended from the emancipation of the Texan Slaves—(estimated by his Correspondent at 15,000)—And the loss, by Texian rivalry, in the Cotton Market of England.—To the North, independent Texas was to be held up as a sort of British Colony, whose smuggling operations would defeat any Tariff, and whose Anti-American prejudices would be fostered by British Capital and emigration.—"Annexation"—it was added—"had become a leading question with the administration, and decided action would take place upon it."

My informant, who has no connexion whatever with Newspapers, dates his communication on the 28th. of August, on which day he left New Orleans—the extract (No 11.) to which I have referred, appeared on the 29th of August.

William Kennedy.

The Earl of Aberdeen, K. T.

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Economic Beginnings of the Far West: How We Won the Land Beyond the Mississippi. By Katharine Coman. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1912. Pp. xix, 418; ix, 450.)

The appearance of this book is significant. It foreshadows the time when the early history of the Trans-Mississippi West will be systematically studied as a whole, and given its due place in the history of the United States. As the first attempt to organize this field on a comprehensive scale, the work is deserving of commendation. The present reviewer by no means agrees with another who maintains that Miss Coman's task was pointless and impossible.

Since the book is new in scope, a brief statement of its contents is due. Volume I, entitled "Explorers and Colonizers," includes: Part I, "The Spanish Occupation (1542-1846)"—the explorers, the colonizers; Part II, "Exploration and the Fur Trade"—The Northwest Coast, the overland search for the western sea, the fur trade. Volume II, entitled "American Settlers," includes: Part III, "The Advance of the Settlers"—Louisiana, the Missouri Territory, the Santa Fé Trade, the colonization of Texas; Part IV, "The Transcontinental Migration"—The acquisition of Oregon, the Mormon migration, the conquest of California; Part V, "Free Land and Free Labor"—the curse of slavery, slavery in the territories, the victory in the North. The volume closes with the Homestead Act of 1862.

The problem of organizing this vast field, even from a single viewpoint, is not easy, and Professor Coman has not solved all the difficulties. In its most general aspect, her organization is correct, the reviewer believes. That is, she treats the Spanish, French, British and Russian activities, and the exploration and fur trading activities of the Americans in the Trans-Mississippi region, as the preparation for the American settler, and then goes back and traces the progress of American settlement, as the second stage of the development of the West. The work very properly begins with an extended statement of the Spanish and French occupation. Both of these topics are treated under the head of

"the Spanish occupation," which does injustice to France. However, this is a healthy reaction against the view that the Spaniards did nothing worthy of mention.

A very serious fault in the plan is a too rigid adherence to the topical method, and a failure to reveal the general historical process as a whole by which the West was opened. For example, the Spanish occupation is traced from Cortés to 1846 before British, American, or Russian activities are introduced. In this way concurrent events and forces are so far separated that the reader fails to see their interrelations. It would be better, in the opinion of the reviewer, to have carried the Spanish and French story to the end of the eighteenth century, when the Spanish influence was at its height, turning then to the British, Russian, and American developments, all of which constituted infractions of the Spanish frontiers.

This fault of a too rigid adherence to the topical plan is even more noticeable in the arrangement of the lesser subdivisions. By treating New Mexico, Louisiana, Texas, and California each separately, from beginning to end, the historical evolution of New Spain is completely lost sight of. What we really have, therefore, is a series of separate histories of the individual provinces, without relation to each other or to the general movement of Spanish-American and of Western American history. By placing the treatment of Louisiana under Spain, beginning with the cession of 1762, before the treatment of Texas in the seventeenth century, is completely to miss the point of the intimate relations between Texas and French Louisiana. Again, the sections devoted to "the Pike Expedition," "the coming of the Americans," and "commercial restrictions," inserted in the chapters on New Mexico, Texas, and California, respectively, are more closely related to each other, historically, than to the chapters in which they stand. They should be brought into relations as parts of the whole Anglo-American southwestward movement in the early nineteenth century. This defect of organization extends to other parts of Volume I and to Volume II. In treating the Northwest, for example, "explorers" are separated from "furtraders"—as though Hanna, Meares, Kendrick, and Gray were primarily explorers and not furtraders.

In matters of proportion and emphasis the disparities are grave.

Though the book purports to be an economic history, the longest chapters are those merely narrative. Thus forty-eight pages are given to the journey of Lewis and Clark, twenty-five to that of the Astoria expedition, ten to the Coronado expedition, ten to Pike, fifteen to La Salle (as against fourteen to the rest of Louisiana under both France and Spain), and six to Burr.

Nevertheless, the chief shortcomings of the book are not those of general plan, but of detail. This can be illustrated by the treatment given to the Spanish province of Texas. In the first place, and explaining all that follows, it is plain from both the bibliography and the text that the author was oblivious or indifferent to practically the whole product, not inconsiderable, of modern scholarship relating to this portion of her field. Not a reference is given, for example, to any one of the fifteen volumes of the Texas State Historical QUARTERLY, or to Clark's doctoral dissertation on *The Beginnings of Texas*. Had these and similar contributions been consulted, a host of inexcusable mistakes would have been avoided.

It will be a surprise to all students of early Texas to learn that in the first half of the seventeenth century "Franciscan friars made several attempts to reach the Tehas" (p. 67). Was a single known attempt made before 1650? If so, the discovery is so important that it should be supported by evidence. The map on p. 78 shows Joutel's route to be from the Ceniz to the lower Natchitoches, when as a matter of fact he went to the Cadodacho, nearly two hundred miles to the northwest of the lower Natchitoches (a small matter, but about the same difference as between Boston and Albany). The Ceniz visited by Joutel were living on the Neches, not on the Trinity. The Cadodacho were not on the Sabine, as the map shows, but near the great bend of the Red River. On page 80 a most surprising route is given for Tonti in his search for La Salle. Perhaps it makes little difference to state that Texas had its beginnings as a Spanish settlement on the Trinity instead of on the Neches (p. 95), but the error is comparable to confusing the Connecticut with the Merrimac, two streams about the same distance apart as the Trinity and the Neches. And who were the Ceniz as distinguished from the Texas? The error in the map on this point on p. 78 is repeated in the text on p. 95, where it is made to appear that the two mis-

sions mentioned (San Francisco and Santísimo Nombre de María) were established for two distinct peoples. As a matter of fact, both were in the same sub-tribe of the Hasinai confederacy, the Nabadache, and within a few miles of each other. These missions were abandoned in October, 1693, and not in 1694 (p. 96).

The mission of "St. Francis de los Neches" was not the same as that of Nacogdoches (p. 97); one was on the Neches and the other forty miles or more eastward, beyond the Angelina, while they were founded by different missionary colleges. Ramón had twenty-four soldiers and ten religious, not "some fifty soldiers and twelve friars" (p. 96). It is implied that the Ramón expedition founded seven instead of six missions in eastern Texas (p. 97). The impression is given on page 97 that only one mission was founded on the San Antonio, instead of eight. The statement regarding the French invasion of Texas in 1719 is greatly overdrawn, to say the least (pp. 97-98). Not thirty, but fifteen, Canary Island families were taken to Texas to found the villa of San Fernando (p. 98). The colony on the Trinity described with some vividness on p. 99 never existed, hence the description is somewhat gratuitous.

The most fundamental misapprehension regarding early Texas is revealed in the description on pp. 99-100 of the mission régime among the "Tejas and the Cenís." The description given would fit the situation on the San Antonio, three hundred miles away, fairly well, but it is a patent fact that the Tejas (Cenís) never consented to live in *pueblos* or to submit to mission discipline. Hence, so far as eastern Texas is concerned, the whole passage is incorrect and beside the point. This misapplication of an interesting passage is due in part to an inadequate study of the Indian situation. It is implied (p. 101) that secularization of the Texas missions was generally effected in 1794, but, as a matter of fact, only one mission, Valero, was then secularized, the process not being completed for all Texas till after the end of the Spanish régime.

It was not in 1777, but several years earlier, that the northern garrisons mentioned on p. 102 were withdrawn. It is a strange confusion of the Indian situation to state that the Comanche were incited by "their hereditary foes," the Apache, to turn their arms against the Spaniards. What is meant is that the Spanish-

Apache alliance made the Comanche hostile to the Spaniards (102). It would probably be difficult to find facts to justify the graphic picture of contraband trade between Texas and Louisiana given on p. 105, and it is far from the truth to state that "when Natchitoches became a Spanish town this trade was no longer illicit." As a matter of fact, for several years after 1770 it was unlawful for even the governor of Texas to so much as correspond with the lieutenant-governor at Natchitoches. Proposals for establishing free commerce between the provinces were discussed for years, and finally negatived, while frequent arrests were made of persons who attempted the trade. These facts have a bearing on the statement regarding contraband on p. 108.

It would be easy to present a vast body of evidence to refute the assertion that there was no attempt to restrict the sale of weapons and liquors among the Indians (p. 105). On the other hand, the statement regarding the suggestion of the governor of Louisiana relative to the distribution of "ardiente" (*aguardiente*) and cheap firearms suggests unfamiliarity with the lengthy "Instrucción" on this point issued by the viceroy in 1786.

If the statement on p. 106 is intended to mean that "many Americans crossed the Texas border" before 1800, it should be supported by evidence, for it is not well established. The Red River was not generally "held by the Spanish government to be both the natural and historic boundary" of Texas (p. 110). The Mexican rebellion broke out in 1810, not 1812 (p. 114). It is not true that the viceroy had no troops for the defence of Texas at the outbreak of the War of Independence. The defence by Arredondo was quite efficient and sufficient (p. 114). Magee's expedition was begun in 1812, not 1813 (p. 115). Magee died at La Bahía, and did not succeed "in getting possession of San Antonio," nor did the declaration for the republic await that event (p. 115). Is the "1830" on p. 117 a misprint for "1820?" If so, the "Meantime" following is incorrect. If not, the statement is incorrect.

All of the foregoing citations of inaccuracies have been taken from the few pages devoted to the Spanish province of Texas. Similar misstatements are about as numerous in the pages devoted to Texas in the later period. But there is neither need of nor space for citing them. Perhaps few of the points cited are

vital. But if they were worth mentioning at all, they were worth an attempt to state them correctly, which would have been possible in most of the cases. Moreover, one cannot fail to see that the effect of these inaccuracies is cumulative, and that incorrect general notions must accompany such inaccuracy of detail.

A more casual reading of other portions of the work reveals the same newness to the field on the part of the author. Perhaps the most suggestive comment left for the reviewer to make is that, clearly, four years are not enough to master so large and so new a field as that covered by Professor Coman's book.

HERBERT E. BOLTON.

History of the German Element in Texas from 1820-1850, and Historical Sketches of the German Texas Singers' League and Houston Turnverein from 1853-1913. By Moritz Tiling, Instructor in History, Houston Academy. (Houston, 1913. 12mo. Pp. viii, 225.)

This volume is one of the proofs of the increasing attention that is given to the part played by the Germans in the development of this State. In his preface the author calls attention to the brevity of the mention made of Germans in Texas by former historians. "This plain, unpretending monograph has been written," he informs the reader, "for the purpose of preserving to posterity the records of German achievements in the colonization and up-building of the great State of Texas." (Preface.)

The volume is divided into five parts: 1. The German Element in Texas, 1820-1850 (pages 1-131). 2. Historical sketch of the Texas German Singers' League, 1853-1913 (pages 135-159). 3. Historical sketch of the Houston Turnverein, 1854-1913 (pages 163-175). 4. German Day celebrations in Houston, 1889-1910 (pages 177-181). 5. Appendices (pages 183-225).

The section entitled, "The German Element in Texas, 1820-1850," constitutes the principal part of the book. It is the least satisfactory part of the book. There is no valid reason why the author should select the years 1820 to 1850 as representative of the history of Germans in Texas. Few Germans came to Texas prior to 1830; most of them arrived after 1845. As a matter of fact,

the author deals with less than five years of the history of the majority of Germans in Texas in 1850. No one will assert that only those years of disappointment and hardship deserve a special memorial, or that the Germans have not since greatly aided in the upbuilding of the State.

Almost half of this section of the book (pages 58-113) and a large part of the Appendix (pages 204-225) are devoted to the "Verein zum Schutze deutscher Einwanderer in Texas." The mistakes made at the outset by this association are detailed, and the author severely denounces the whole course pursued by it with reference to the colonization of Texas. The author is too much concerned with the Verein as a business organization and not enough attention is paid to the movement, which the Verein inaugurated, for colonizing Texas with Germans. For instance, the author says (page 83), "This sending of 4,000 immigrants in the fall and winter of 1845 probably was the most inexcusable of the many blunders of the Adelsverein." As a matter of fact, whether the Verein was swindled or not, whether its officers were efficient or ignorant, whether its objects were humanitarian or selfish are minor details viewed from the vantage ground the passing years have given us. The essential thing to the student of the history of Texas is that this Verein so successfully turned the tide of German emigration toward Texas in 1845 that emigrants continued to pour into this State for years after the Verein had been smashed.

On page 108 the author again speaks of "the senseless haste with which the emigrants were sent to Texas by the Adelsverein." Yet when the direful catastrophe occurred and the Verein in 1847 was declared bankrupt, he notes (page 110) rather naïvely that "it proved well for them [the colonists] that they were forced to remain" in Texas, and that "after the first outbursts of despair and agony . . . they all set determinedly to work, and by hard and persistent labor . . . and living on the barest necessities of life for several years, they not only succeeded in establishing a firm existence for themselves, but in course of time made New Braunfels and Fredericksburg the garden spots of Texas." The Verein failed, but the German colonists prospered.

The "Historical sketch of the Texas Staats Saengerbund, 1853-

1913" is the best part of the book. The principal fault to be found with it is the partiality shown the Houston members of the Saengerbund; after 1891 only those of the biennial meetings are described which met at Houston. While the author is content to present a purely chronological sketch, he brings to the subject a fund of first hand information and shows an appreciation of the cultural worth of music and song when fostered by a people.

The History of the Houston Turnverein and the account of the German Day celebrations at Houston are also well written, but, of course, are primarily of local interest; similar organizations and events in other Texas cities are nowhere touched upon.

E. W. WINKLER.

NEWS ITEMS

Miss Eleanor Buckley, who for some years has been calendaring the Bexar archives at the University of Texas, has gone to the University of Pennsylvania to continue study in history for the doctorate. Mrs. Mattie Austin Hatcher has taken up Miss Buckley's work in the archives.

Dr. Frederic Duncalf, for the past two years Adjunct Professor of Medieval history at the University of Texas, has accepted a similar position at the University of Illinois.

William Edward Dunn has been appointed instructor in Spanish American history at the University of Texas. He will offer graduate courses in early Texas history and in the history of the Southwest, and during the summers will direct the work of making transcripts of historical documents in Mexican and other foreign archives.

The *Brenham Daily Press* on September 1 issued a special industrial edition, which contains a "Chronological History of Brenham" and the "Social History of Brenham," by Mrs. R. E. Pennington, and the address delivered by Dr. Richard F. Brenham, at Austin, on April 21, 1840, copied from the *Austin City Gazette* May 13, 1840.

W. P. Zuber, perhaps the last survivor of those under the command of General Houston at San Jacinto, died at Austin, September 22, 1913. He was born in Twiggs county, Georgia, July 6, 1820. During the last few years he wrote his reminiscences and planned to publish them under the title, "Eighty Years in Texas."

"Rev. R. H. Crozier, D. D., for twenty-one years pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, of Palestine, Texas, passed away at his home in that city, July 16th. . . . Dr. Crozier was born at Coffeeville, Mississippi, January 28, 1836, and was educated at Oxford University, being graduated in June, 1857. In April, 1861, he was made captain of Company I, Thirty-third Mississippi Regiment. . . . He was licensed to preach in April, 1873. . . . Besides being a strong preacher, he was known as an author." [The titles of some of his books are "Araphel, or The Falling Stars of

1833;" "Fiery Trials;" "Deep Waters.]"—*Christian Observer*, August 6, 1913.

Captain William A. Pitts died at Austin, October 13, at the age of eighty-three. Since 1850, when he enlisted in Henry E. McCullough's company of Texas Rangers, he has been a prominent figure in the military and civil history of the State. A brief sketch of his career appears in the *Dallas News*, of October 14.

On February 1, 1913, John W. Curd died at his home in El Paso, of acute nephritis.

Mr. Curd was born August 29, 1876, at Paducah, Kentucky. In early boyhood he came to Texas, where he spent the remainder of his life. On July 31, 1901, he married Miss Anna Wallace at Abilene. He is survived by his wife and four children, two sons and two daughters.

Mr. Curd's career was typical of that of the American teacher. He was reared on a farm and his early education was secured in the public schools. After teaching three years, he entered the State University in 1901, and was graduated in 1904. At the time of graduation he was awarded a Fellowship in Physics, but instead became teacher of History, and later principal, in the El Paso School, where he established a reputation as one of the strongest History teachers in the State.

Recognizing the rich possibilities for local historical work in the El Paso region, Mr. Curd at once began to investigate that field, a work which took him to Mexico City and Chihuahua, and into the local archives at Juarez. Some of the results of his studies were published in historical articles in the local press. He also was active in the promotion of a local historical society.

It was Mr. Curd's purpose to continue his studies in the University of California, and in 1912 he resigned his position in the High School to enter business, with the hope of being able sooner to carry out that plan. Meanwhile he taught history in the El Paso Military Institute.

In the death of Mr. Curd the Southwest lost a man of sterling qualities, a history teacher of first rank, and a student of much promise.—H. E. B.

THE SOUTHWESTERN HISTORICAL QUARTERLY

Vol. XVII.*

JANUARY, 1913

No. 3

The publication committee and the editors disclaim responsibility for views expressed by contributors to THE QUARTERLY.

TEXAS AND THE BOUNDARY ISSUE, 1822-1829

WILLIAM R. MANNING

It is the purpose of this article to study the diplomatic relations between Mexico and the United States concerning Texas and the boundary issue from 1822 to 1829. Internal affairs in Texas will be alluded to only when they furnish an occasion for or exercise an influence upon diplomatic communications.

The secret instructions given October 31, 1822, to Zozaya, the first Mexican minister to the United States, required him to ask the views of that government with reference to the limits of Louisiana. He was told that the imperial Mexican government considered the treaty of February 22, 1819, between the United States and Spain valid, and was disposed to carry out its provisions for establishing permanent landmarks. He was to learn whether any settlements had been effected or were being planned which would prejudice the rights of the Empire under that treaty.¹

Spain's refusal to ratify the treaty for almost two years in the vain effort to induce the United States to agree not to recognize her rebellious colonies had delayed its execution until Mexico had become de facto independent. The recognition of that independence by the United States in the early part of 1822 made it necessary to reckon henceforth with Mexico in any matter concerning

*Volumes I-XV published as THE QUARTERLY of the Texas State Historical Association.

¹Instrucciones Reservadas para Zozaya, 31 de Octubre de 1822, *La Diplomacia Mexicana*, I, 85. This treaty later known as the Florida Treaty is spoken of in the correspondence of the time as the Treaty of Washington.

the southwestern boundary. In the meantime much had been said concerning the treaty and the claim to Texas which many asserted the United States had acquired in purchasing Louisiana from France. There was a strong disposition on the part of many people, some having considerable influence with the government, to take advantage of the change of sovereignty to regain the territory which they insisted had thus been bartered away.² This sentiment in the United States was strengthened by a statement of Onís, the Spanish negotiator of the treaty, to the effect that "it is improperly called a treaty of cession, as it is in reality one of exchange or permutation of one small province for another of double the extent, richer and more fertile."³

The language of Onís also strengthened the suspicious fears of the Mexican government concerning the intentions of the United States. Elsewhere he says, "The Americans at present think themselves superior to all the nations of Europe; and believe that their dominion is destined to extend now to the Isthmus of Panama and hereafter over all the regions of the new world. Their government entertains the same ideas, and the whole course of its policy calculates upon the illusions of these flattering expectations."⁴ The ephemeral republic proclaimed by Long in 1819 and the colonization enterprises of the Austins and others in the following years confirmed the suspicions of the Mexicans. Less than a month after Minister Zozaya had landed at Baltimore, less than two weeks after his formal reception at Washington, and only two days after the banquet which President Monroe gave in his honor, he wrote his government on December 26, 1822, that he had discovered ambitious views with reference to the province of Texas. In the national Congress and in the state legislatures, he said, there was talk of enlarging the army and militia, which movement he believed had no other object than that arising out of their am-

²The discussion of the basis for, the character of, and the justice of this claim is not in place here. See Rives, *United States and Mexico*, I, 1-26; Smith, *Annexation of Texas*, 5-8; Babcock, *Rise of American Nationality*, 285-289; Cox, "Louisiana-Texas Frontier," *THE QUARTERLY*, X, 1-75; Bancroft, *North Mexican States and Texas*, II, 46-53; and footnotes in each.

³Onís, *Memoir*, 146. Onís's *Memoria* was printed in Madrid in 1820; and this translation was printed in Baltimore the following year.

⁴*Ibid.*, 23.

bition for Texas. He declared: "In time they will be our sworn enemies, and foreseeing this we ought to treat them as such from the present day."⁵ In August of 1823 Torrens, the Mexican Chargé, wrote his government that he frequently noticed the public papers enlarging on the fine location and fertility of the territory of Texas and reminding the government that it ought not to have lost the opportunity to obtain this rich province from Spain; and one of the objections which the enemies of the secretary of state were urging against his candidacy for the presidency was that he had ceded the province to the Spaniards. In the same letter Torrens advised his government not to permit the American population to become preponderant in Texas.⁶ Mexican authorities in Texas were at the same time sending alarming reports of the activities of United States military establishments near the border. As a result of these the imperial government had sent a secret emissary into Texas in the latter part of 1822 to ascertain the true intentions of the United States.⁷

On October 1, 1823, Alaman, who was secretary for foreign affairs of the provisional government which had taken control after the fall of Iturbide in the spring, instructed Torrens to use all his skill and energy to have the boundary which had been established between the United States and Spain confirmed and marked out.⁸ When Torrens received this instruction he asked an inter-

⁵Nota del Ministro Zozaya, 26 de Diciembre de 1822, *La Dipl. Mex.*, I, 103. He virtually repeats the language of Onís when he says: "La soberbia de estos republicanos no les permite vernos como iguales, sino como inferiores; su evanecimiento se extiende en mi juicio á creer que su capital lo será de todas las Americas."

⁶Nota del . . . Torrens, 21 de Agosto de 1823, *La Dipl. Mex.*, II, 22. *Ibid.*, 50-53, Torrens writes at length on proposed Anglo-American colonies in Texas, saying among other things, "mi opinion es, que intentando algunos agentes de Nuevo Orleans hacer establecimientos de anglo-americanos en Texas, con el mismo objeto que lo habían hecho en Baton Rouge, de adquirir una influencia y maioría en la población y hacerlos declarar que querían unirse á los Estados Unidos, etc. . . . Por tanto, me parece peligroso permitirles establecerse en gran número y formando pueblos separados, porque esto vendría á ser el origen de disensiones con los Estados Unidos." He asks for instructions concerning the course he should pursue regarding limits. He had not received any on that subject since the change in government following Iturbide's deposition.

⁷Bugbee, "Texas Frontier, 1820-1825," 114 (Reprint from *Publications Southern Historical Association*, March, 1900). As evidence he cites letters in the Bexar Archives.

⁸Alaman to Torrens, 1 de Octubre de 1823, *La Dipl. Mex.*, II, 33. Alaman's Memorial to Congress, Nov. 1, 1823, in *British and Foreign State*

view with Adams before delivering any note on the subject to learn in advance whether there would be any difficulty in carrying it out. On January 26, 1824, he wrote that he had discovered some difficulties. The time provided in the treaty for the appointment of commissioners by both governments to mark the boundary had expired. Then a proclamation of the king of Spain had declared null and void everything that had been enacted by the constitutional government which had ratified the treaty. He proposed to wait fifteen or twenty days before he handed the government a note asking its intentions. According to that explanation he would word his reply; but he would insist that the attitude of Spain had nothing now to do with the matter, and that Mexico and the United States should proceed to carry out the treaty, naming their commissioners to mark the boundary, if not by virtue of the fourth article of the Spanish treaty, then by a new convention. He was sure the government would attempt to gain some advantage by this new pretext, and would not be surprised if the troops on the frontier should be ordered to advance into Mexican territory, so unlimited was their ambition for Texas. General Jackson, to whom he had been introduced, had declared in his presence that the government ought never to have lost the opportunity to obtain it. In the same conversation Jackson had said the way to obtain a territory was to occupy it, and after having possession treat for it, as had been done in Florida. It would not be strange, Torrens said, if the coming election should result in his elevation to the presidency, in which case he would be sure to employ this method.⁹

The note which Torrens presented February 15, 1824, declared that the Supreme Executive Power of Mexico wishing to remove all matters that might affect the good understanding which it desired to maintain with the United States had instructed him to ask, "that the limits between the two countries be fixed according to the third article of the treaty of Washington of the 22d of February, 1819, . . . I have therefore the honor to transmit the present communication to your Excellency in order to ascer-

Papers, X, 1072; and Poinsett, *Notes*, 311. He says the chargé has been instructed to secure the confirmation of this line.

⁹Nota del . . . Torrens, 26 de Enero de 1824, *La Dipl. Mex.*, II, 73.

tain whether the Executive of the United States is disposed to acknowledge the said article, and will accordingly appoint the commissioners aforesaid; requesting at the same time that your Excellency may be pleased to inform me as early as convenient, of the intention of the President of the United States on the subject."¹⁰ A little more than a month after presenting this note Torrens wrote his government that he had received no reply.¹¹ Five months after its presentation he wrote that he had asked an interview with the secretary of state to learn why no reply had been sent.¹² But still no reply came. On April 15, 1824, the political chief of the Department of Texas had written the government at Mexico that he was certain "the United States was 'trying to annul or at least has the idea of annulling' the treaty of 1819, and he believed the American government would then assert its claim to the banks of the Rio Grande." Similar alarming reports from the same source followed. From various officials in Texas many letters were sent warning the government against the danger of permitting Anglo-American colonists to come in such large numbers into that territory.¹³

When in the middle of 1824 Obregon was appointed minister to Washington his secret instructions, dated August 30, told him the reports of Torrens indicated that the United States had intentions on Mexican territories in the Californias, New Mexico, and Texas; and with reference to the last those intentions were general and public. Obregon was told to pay particular attention to this matter. At this time the Mexican government seems to have been uncertain whether this was or was not an opportune time to press the negotiation for a treaty of limits. In the original draft of these secret instructions in the archives of the foreign office in Mexico, there was inserted and then erased a paragraph saying he was not to begin the negotiation for the treaty of limits

¹⁰Torrens to Adams, Feb. 15, 1824, *House Executive Documents*, 25th congress, 1st session, No. 42, p. 6; *British and Foreign State Papers*, XXVI, 828.

¹¹Torrens to Secretario, 23 de Marzo de 1824, MS. Relaciones Exteriores.

¹²Same to same, 14 de Julio de 1824, MS. Relaciones Exteriores.

¹³Bugbee, "Texas Frontier, 1820-1825," 115, citing Bexar Archives. A letter of Sept. 19, 1824, from the political chief said, "The Anglo-American government counts this province as its own and includes it on its maps, tracing its boundaries from the sources of the Rio Grande to its mouth on the coast of Tamaulipas."

till circumstances were more favorable; but if necessity should arise to say anything about the matter he was to claim the limits of the treaty of 1819. Immediately following this erased paragraph is one which completely reversed it. In that he is told that the principal object of his mission is the negotiation of a treaty of limits as early as possible and in the most advantageous terms. He was to use his best efforts to secure the acknowledgment and ratification of the pending treaty between the United States and Spain. If before such negotiation should be completed the United States or its citizens should attempt the occupation of any territory belonging to Mexico under that treaty he should formulate claims on it as a basis. He was told that great circumspection was necessary in reference to all who came from the United States since there was danger of the introduction of spies or of invaders in disguise. In carrying out his general instructions regarding the admission of colonists he was to bear in mind these secret instructions. All reports on these matters were to be in cipher.¹⁴

Oregon's general instructions bearing the same date as his secret instructions told him that colonization was one of the most important matters then occupying the attention of the government. He was asked to call attention to the general law of August 18, 1824, on the subject, and to publish its regulations in the newspapers of the United States. All colonists from the United States, he was reminded, must bear passports and recommendations from Mexican diplomatic or consular agents in the United States. It was necessary to know the place of origin, the means of support, and the character of all colonists or empresarios. Those under suspicion, vicious adventurers, or vagabonds were to be excluded. But industrious persons, especially artisans, ship-

¹⁴Instrucciones mui Reservadas, 30 de Agosto de 1824, MS. Rel. Ext. It is interesting to note here that Mexicans thought of asserting claim to the Oregon country. Torrens wrote that the settlement of that country was being considered in the United States Congress, where it was being urged that to leave this territory occupied by Indians, with England on one side and Mexico on the other to intrigue with the Indians, was dangerous to the United States and could do more harm than all Europe. Torrens added that he thought it would be dangerous to Mexico to permit the United States to occupy it. Torrens to Secretario, 5 de Mayo de 1824, MS. Rel. Ext.

builders, and fishermen were to be encouraged and given lands.¹⁵

Before the time of Poinsett's appointment as minister from the United States to Mexico in March of 1825 no reply had been made to Torrens's note of more than a year earlier and no negotiation had been undertaken for the settlement of the boundary. With the new minister, Obregon, no communication had passed on the subject. In the instructions which were given to Poinsett on March 26, 1825, by Henry Clay, secretary of state under the new Adams administration, the third article of the treaty of 1819 with Spain was quoted describing the boundary line, and the fourth article providing for its demarcation was mentioned. He was told that the treaty had not yet been carried into execution, but that "having been concluded when Mexico composed a part of the dominions of Spain, it is obligatory upon both the United States and Mexico." Torrens's note of February 15 of the preceding year is cited as indicating the willingness of Mexico to accede to that treaty. But Clay continued:

Some difficulties may possibly hereafter arise between the two countries from the line thus agreed upon, against which it would be desirable now to guard, if practicable; and as the government of Mexico may be supposed not to have any disinclination to the fixation of a new line which would prevent those difficulties, the President wishes you to sound it on that subject; and to avail yourself of a favorable disposition, if you should find it, to effect that object. The line of the Sabine approaches our great western mart nearer than could be wished. Perhaps the Mexican government may not be unwilling to establish that of the Rio Brassos de Dios, or the Rio Colorado, or the Snow Mountains, or the Rio del Norte in lieu of it. By the agreed line, portions of both the

¹⁵Instrucciones, 30 de Agosto de 1824, MS. Rel. Ext. For text of the colonization law see Mexico, *Leyes, Decretos, y Ordenes que forman el Derecho Internacional*, 125. This is a government publication in three parts, of which this is part three. Parts one and two are *Tratados y Convenciones*. See note 32. For a discussion of the law, see any Texas history.

On March 23, 1824, Torrens had reported to his government that the Swiss consul at Washington had asked him if there would be any objection to receiving colonists from Switzerland; and he had replied that he thought they would be received since they were an industrious people and could not be enemies to liberal institutions. Torrens to Secretario, 23 de Marzo de 1824, MS. Rel. Ext. On July 10 the government at Mexico approved this act of Torrens and authorized him to assure the Swiss consul that Catholics from his country would find a favorable reception. Secretario to Torrens, 10 de Julio de 1824, MS. Rel. Ext.

Red River and branches of the Arkansas are thrown on the Mexican side, and the navigation of both of these rivers, as well as that of the Sabine, is made common to the respective inhabitants of the two countries. When the countries adjacent to those waters shall become thickly inhabited, collisions and misunderstandings may arise from the community thus established, in the use of their navigation, which it would be well now to prevent.

As an additional motive to induce Mexico to consent to such an alteration Clay suggested that it would place the capital of Mexico nearer the center of the Mexican territories, and, further, that the troublesome Comanche Indians would be left to the United States. These arguments, if ever presented, were probably about as convincing as it would be for a large land owner to say to a neighboring small farmer, "Your house is not in the middle of your fields. Give me forty acres next to my line and you will not have to go so far to work. Besides, this field contains an ugly patch of thistles which my superior industry and intelligence will enable me to cope with more successfully than you can." Clay showed that he was not prepared to insist on a change of the line nor to urge the matter unduly by saying, in concluding his instructions with reference to the boundary: "But if you should find that the Mexican government is unwilling to alter the agreed line in the manner proposed and that it insists upon the execution of the third and fourth articles of the treaty before mentioned, you are authorized to agree to the recognition and establishment of the line as described in the third article, and to the demarcation of it forthwith, as is stipulated in the fourth."¹⁶

Before Poinsett had opportunity to open negotiations respecting the boundary, in fact only two days after his formal reception by the president of Mexico, that official received an interesting sidelight on Poinsett's personal views with reference to the most desirable location of the boundary line. On June 3, 1825, a man named Azcarate who had been an official close to Iturbide wrote a

¹⁶Clay to Poinsett, March 26, 1825, MS. Department of State, Instructions, X, 225; extracts are printed in *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 1s., No. 42, p. 5; and *B. and F. St. P.*, XXVI, 829. For brief discussions of Poinsett's instructions concerning Texas, see Reeves, *Diplomacy under Tyler and Polk*, 61; Garrison, *Texas*, 170; Bancroft, *N. Mex. Sts. and Tex.*, II, 88; McMaster, *U. S.*, V, 460; Von Holst, *United States (1828-1846)*, 553; Falconer, *Discovery of the Mississippi*, 48; Kennedy, *Texas*, I, 370; Adams, "Texas Speech" in *H. of R.*, 1838, p. 106.

letter to President Victoria saying that when Poinsett arrived at the coast of Mexico in 1822 he was received by General Santa Anna as an official envoy, and when he reached the capital he was supposed by all to have this character and was so presented to the Emperor. After the presentation Poinsett had told the writer that he desired an interview to speak of an interesting matter. At the time appointed the writer met him expecting the communication to be official. With a map before him Poinsett pointed out the line of 1819 but said he thought it was not a desirable one, and then traced a line which showed that he desired to absorb all Texas, New Mexico, and Upper California, and parts of Lower California, Sonora, Coahuila, and Nuevo Leon. Repressing his anger Azcarate replied that by virtue of the treaty of Iguala [Córdoba?] the Mexican government would always respect the Onís treaty and would never cede a handbreadth of territory. An appointment was made to continue the interview the next day.

In the meantime Azcarate saw Iturbide, explained the matter, and received authority to use his judgment in finding definitely the character of the proposals Poinsett had to make. Before entering on the discussion at the second meeting Azcarate presented his credentials and asked for Poinsett's. The latter thereupon declared that he came in no public character but merely as a traveler, and was only expressing his own personal opinion. Although it was evident that the discussion could be only an academic one, nevertheless the interview was continued and Azcarate was able, he said, to perceive five purposes which Poinsett had in mind: namely, to get possession of rich mineral lands; to gain ports on both seas for controlling the commerce between them; to get control of the fur trade with the Indians; to get control of the fisheries in the Californias; and to monopolize the coasting trade on both seas. Azcarate concluded his observations by saying that in his conception the establishment of limits was to be the apple of discord between the United States and Mexico. His desire for the happiness of the fatherland was his motive, he told Victoria, for making this communication. He said it was possible that slight errors might have crept into this account of the interview, but it was substantially true and could be verified from a report in the

office of foreign relations which he delivered to Iturbide at the time without preserving a copy.¹⁷

On July 12, 1825, about six weeks after Poinsett's reception, occurred his first conference with Alaman, the Mexican minister of foreign relations, concerning the boundary. In it he had "suggested that, although the government of the United States held itself bound to carry into effect the treaty of limits concluded with the king of Spain the 22d of February, 1819, still it would appear more becoming the independent character of this government to lay aside that treaty altogether, and to endeavor to establish a boundary which would be more easily defined, and which might be mutually more advantageous." The secretary expressed himself much gratified by such a suggestion, and proposed that the two governments should forthwith appoint commissioners to make a reconnoissance of the country bordering on the line formerly settled with Spain, so as to obtain such information in regard to "that portion of our respective territories as would enable us to act understandingly on the subject." Poinsett objected that such a commission would delay the negotiation at least two years since it would take nearly a year to arrange for the commission and another year to do its work and make a report. Alaman replied that his government would be very unwilling to fix the limits on the very slender information which it then possessed.¹⁸

On the matter of the difference of opinion as to the proposed commission to examine the country near the border an exchange of formal notes occurred a few days later in which each gave at length his reasons for the position he had taken.¹⁹ As Poinsett anticipated, the government at Washington refused to accede to the proposal for a joint commission since such was

¹⁷Azcarate to Victoria, 3 de Junio de 1825, MS. Rel. Ext. Azcarate was appointed as minister to England in 1822 by the imperial government, but did not go. See Bocanegra, *Memorias*, I, 76. Poinsett tells of his presentation to Iturbide on Nov. 3, 1822, but of course says nothing of this conversation with Azcarate. In his description of the emperor Poinsett shows his antipathy to monarchy in general and to the imperial system of Iturbide in particular. Poinsett, *Notes on Mexico*, 67, 69.

¹⁸Poinsett to Clay, July 18, 1825, MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Despatches, I; extracts in *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 1s., No. 42, p. 19; and *B. and F. St. P.*, XXVI, 831.

¹⁹Alaman to Poinsett, July 20, 1825, and Poinsett to Alaman, July 27, 1825, MS. Dept. of St., Mex. Desp., I; *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 1s., No. 42, p. 20; *B. and F. St. P.*, XXVI, 831.

considered unnecessary and would be reversing the usual procedure, which was to decide on the principle and then send the joint commission to mark the line in accordance with the agreement. If examination were needful before deciding on the line it would be better for each government to send a separate commission. The United States had no objection to Mexico's doing so if desired; but hoped no unnecessary time would be lost in resuming the negotiation.²⁰

In reporting to Clay on July 27, what had passed between himself and Alaman on the subject, Poinsett said: "I find that there exists great apprehension in the minds of the people of this country that the government of the United States contemplate renewing their claim to the territory north of the Rio Bravo del Norte; and it may be of some importance to consider their great sensibility on this subject." He added in cipher: "It appears to me that it will be important to gain time if we wish to extend our territory beyond the boundary agreed upon by the treaty of 1819. Most of the good land from the Colorado to the Sabine has been granted by the State of Texas and is rapidly peopling with either grantees or squatters from the United States, a population they will find difficult to govern, and perhaps after a short period they may not be so averse to part with that portion of their territory as they are at present."²¹ A little more than a week after sending this first report on limits Poinsett again wrote in cipher: "I feel very anxious about the boundary line between the two nations. While it will be politic not to justify their jealous fears on that subject by extravagant pretensions, I think it of the greatest importance that we should extend our territory toward the Rio del Norte either to the Colorado or at least to the Brazos. We ought to have on the frontier a hardy race of white settlers, which the climate of that region of country situated between the Mississippi and the Sabine will not admit of."²² Five days later another

²⁰Clay to Poinsett, Sept. 24, 1825, MS. Dept. of St., Instr., X, 835; extracts in *American State Papers, Foreign*, VI, 581; *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 1s., No. 42, p. 7; and *B. and F. St. P.*, XXVI, 836.

²¹Poinsett to Clay, July 27, 1825, MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., I; extract not including the cipher portion is in *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 1s., No. 42, p. 20; and *B. and F. St. P.*, XXVI, 833. Reeves, *Diplomacy under Tyler and Polk*, 62.

²²Poinsett to Clay, Aug. 5, 1825, MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., I. Reeves, *Diplomacy under Tyler and Polk*, 63.

despatch to Clay, mostly in cipher, told of Alaman's declaring, in what was supposed to be a secret session of congress, that the United States ought to be regarded as enemies rather than as friends, because:

Mexico had everything to fear from our ambitions and nothing to hope from our friendship. He cited the treaty of limits with Spain as an instance of our disposition to encroach upon her territory. There are a few members of both houses disposed to view the treaty of 1819 in the same light, and it is possible if the question be left open and the discussion renewed this government may revive the absurd pretensions of Cevallos with regard to the western boundary of Louisiana. I am thus particular because I think it advisable that the President should be possessed of every circumstance that can aid him to come to a correct decision upon this subject.²³

Poinsett's suspicions that the Mexican officials were going to try to push the line further east instead of permitting the United States to push it west proved to be well founded. In an interview respecting the boundary on September 20, 1825, Alaman asked Poinsett to trace on a map the boundary between the United States and Spain as defined by the treaty of 1795. Poinsett did so and then asked why the Mexican negotiator had wished it done. The latter replied that he thought it advisable to specify the ancient boundary in the commercial treaty they were about concluding and leave it so until the new line should be agreed on in the new treaty of limits to be concluded. Poinsett then declared to Alaman that before 1819 the United States had claimed to the Rio Bravo del Norte and Spain had claimed to the Mississippi. He also asserted that the treaty of that year with Spain was binding on the Mexican States, having been concluded before their emancipation from Spain and since acknowledged by their accredited agent in the United States. It was only motives of delicacy toward Mexico that had prevented the United States from carrying that treaty into full effect. It was the same motive that had caused him to propose the conclusion of an entirely new treaty. But he would not yield one square inch of land which had been included within the limits of the United States according to that

²³Poinsett to Clay, Aug. 10, 1825, MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., I.

treaty. In his opinion a more advantageous line might be drawn; but such was not to be sought for east of the Sabine nor north of the Red River or the Arkansas. Finally, Poinsett asserted that he would not consent to the insertion of any such article in the commercial treaty without at the same time renewing in it the claim of the United States to all of the country north and east of the Rio Bravo del Norte.²⁴

In October, 1825, a radical change occurred in the Mexican ministry which displaced partisans of the centralist faction and replaced them with federalists favorable to the interests of the United States. It was thought that Poinsett had been largely instrumental in bringing about the change and it was suspected that he was using his influence to secure a treaty of limits through his friends which would extend the borders of his country at the expense of Mexico. But if he was trying to do so, as he probably was not, he was unsuccessful. One of the new ministers, writing to another on November 7, 1825, reminded him of the "memorable words of the laws of the Indies, which say, 'We promise and give our honor and royal word for us and our successors, that never shall be alienated or separated in whole or in part, either its cities (of America) or inhabitants, for any cause or reason, or in favor of any person whatever. And if we or our successors should make any donation or alienation contrary to the aforesaid, it is null and such we declare it.'" According to this the whole Florida treaty was null. But in this minister's conception there was another reason why Mexico was at liberty to ignore the Florida treaty if desirous of doing so. He declared that the treaty, though approved by the Spanish cortes, did not have the "consent of the Mexican delegation, which refused to sign it."²⁵

Thus within a few months after the negotiations had begun each government discovered that the other, while claiming to be willing to ratify and abide by the treaty of 1819, was really wishing to secure the extreme limits claimed by the United States on the one side and by Spain on the other before that treaty was concluded. Each had also discovered that the other was determined

²⁴Poinsett to Clay, Sept. 20, 1825, MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., I; *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 1s., No. 42, p. 23; *B. and F. St. P.*, XXVI, 835.

²⁵Esteva to Llave, Nov. 7, 1825, enclosure with Poinsett to Clay, Jan. 4, 1826, MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., I.

not to give up anything which that treaty secured to it. But each hoped something would happen to break down the determination of the other. Having thus found it impossible to come to any understanding for the time regarding the matter of limits, little of importance passed between the negotiators on the subject for more than a year.

In the meantime the influence was working which Poinsett had said would probably in time make Mexico less unwilling to part with Texas. The settlement of the territory was progressing rapidly. Obregon in Washington reported to his government that these settlements were Mexican only in name, belonging in customs and inclinations almost wholly to the United States.²⁶ Indians in Texas were becoming more and more troublesome as they saw their lands being so rapidly taken away from them. The minister of war notified the minister of foreign relations that officials near the border complained of the sale of arms and ammunition to the Indians by citizens of the United States.²⁷ On June 16, 1826, Camacho, the secretary of foreign relations, called the matter to Poinsett's attention,²⁸ and on June 20, Poinsett reported the complaint to Clay.²⁹ Steps were taken to locate a Mexican consul at Natchitoches in Louisiana to prevent the importation of arms by that route and to enforce the regulations restricting the admission of colonists.³⁰ In March Poinsett protested against certain grants

²⁶Obregon to Secretario, 12 de Noviembre de 1825, MS. Rel. Ext.

²⁷Pedraza to Secretario, 10 de Febrero, 24 de Febrero, and 9 de Junio de 1826; and Blanco to Secretario, 7 de Agosto de 1826; all in MS. Rel. Ext.

²⁸Camacho to Poinsett, 20 de Junio de 1826, MS. Rel. Ext.; and MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., II.

²⁹Poinsett to Camacho, June 20, 1826, MS. Rel. Ext.; Poinsett to Clay, June 20, 1826, MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., II. The last declares that hostile tribes in Mexico were in the habit of capturing defenceless Mexicans and carrying them across the border where United States citizens ransomed them and held them till their friends in Mexico redeemed them. This encouraged Indian warfare.

³⁰Erasmus Seguin of Bexar was appointed to the post in January, 1826; but in May asked to be relieved from serving because of his ill-health, because of the unhealthfulness of the climate of Natchitoches, and because he could not take his numerous family with him. His credentials and detailed instructions accompany his letter of appointment. Secretario to Seguin, 21 de Enero de 1826; Seguin to Secretario, 28 de Marzo de 1826; MS. Rel. Ext.

Bernardo Gutierrez, commandant of Tamaulipas, wrote in March urging the appointment of a consul at Natchitoches and recommending a resident of the place named Juan Cortes whom he had met there in 1812. Pedraza to Secretario, 7 de Marzo de 1826, MS. Rel. Ext.

of land which he heard had been made near the border in Texas, saying he would not consider any grant as valid which was made while negotiations were pending in case such grants should lie in territory ultimately included in the United States.³¹ When in June, 1826, the negotiations for the commercial treaty were nearing conclusion the Mexican plenipotentiaries proposed an additional article declaring that the contracting parties would take into consideration as soon as possible the negotiation of a treaty of limits, and in the meantime would facilitate in any way needed the work of the commissions sent by either power to examine the country near the proposed boundary; and declaring also that unauthorized acts or settlements by the citizens of one country in territory that should fall to the other should not constitute valid claims.³² In accepting the article Poinsett declared it was totally unnecessary because the United States considered the treaty of 1819 with Spain binding and was ready to execute it.

The undersigned was instructed, however, by his government to accede to the wishes of Mexico, if it desired to fix a new line, which might obviate some difficulties which are supposed to attend the existence of the present limits as agreed upon by the treaty aforesaid. But he was especially instructed not to insist upon changing this line contrary to the wishes of the Mexican government, but to agree to carry all the provisions of the treaty of Washington concluded between the United States of America and Spain into full effect, so far forth as relates to the boundaries of the two countries, if required to do so by the Mexican government.³³

At the end of the year 1826 an event occurred in Texas which partially fulfilled Poinsett's prophecy made a year and a half

³¹Poinsett to Clay, March 18, 1826, MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., I; *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 1s., No. 42, p. 24; Poinsett told of the effort of John D. Hunter to obtain a grant of land for Indians who were anxious to move over the frontier from the United States into Texas. The "government refused to give them a large tract of land where they might remain in a body; but offered to settle them in different parts of the country." Poinsett thought it would not be politic for the United States to permit Indians thus to move in bodies across the border. Poinsett to Clay, April 30, 1826, MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., I.

³²Camacho and Esteva to Poinsett, June 19, 1826, *Am. St. P., For.*, VI, 599; Mexico, *Tratados y Convenciones*, II, 125.

³³Poinsett to Plenipotentiaries, June 26, 1826, *Am. St. P., For.*, VI, 599; Mexico *Trat. y Conv.*, II, 126. For the additional articles see *Ibid.*, 144.

earlier. This was the well known Fredonian Revolt. It was led by Hayden Edwards, who had received from the Mexican authorities a large empresario grant in the neighborhood of Nacogdoches, which grant had subsequently been revoked because he had been unsuccessful in his indiscreet though well meant efforts to overcome difficulties that were all but insuperable. Blinded with anger and a desire for revenge and fatuously hoping the people of the other Anglo-American colonies would come to his assistance, he and a few associates formed a treaty with the Cherokee Indians, issued a declaration of independence, raised a red-and-white flag symbolizing a union between the red and white men, and drew a line dividing Texas between the two races. Austin issued a violent denunciation of the revolt; and members of his and other colonies joined the Mexican authorities to put it down. The Fredonians, unsupported and discouraged, disbanded with scarcely an attempt at resistance.³⁴

This independence movement, although in itself the merest fiasco, is of very great importance as marking a turning point in the relations between the two countries. It created a great sensation in both and furnished the occasion for numerous diplomatic

³⁴Most writers on Texas history have discussed the questions whether Edwards was justified in starting the revolt and whether Austin was justified in opposing it. G. M. Bryan in *Comprehensive History of Texas*, I, 506-534, gives a full and careful account quoting a large number of documents from the Austin papers. He explains without unduly condemning Edwards's actions, and fully justifies Austin's. Yoakum, in the same volume, 114-121, justifies Edwards and mildly excuses Austin. Brown, *Texas*, I, 131-140, is more sympathetic with the Fredonians than Bryan but not so enthusiastic as Yoakum. He says "Austin was justified in his course but not in his denunciations." Foote, *Texas and the Texans*, I, 218-292, gives a long sympathetic account of the revolt, quoting many letters and enthusiastically praising B. W. Edwards, who was his personal friend. He explains without condemning Austin's attitude. Bancroft, *N. Mex. Sts. and Tex.*, II, 98-110, gives an impartial account, explaining without severely condemning either. Garrison, *Texas*, 165, says Edwards would have found it difficult to avoid trouble "even if he had shown the utmost prudence; but his want of caution, not to say his improprieties, lay on him heavy responsibility for the result. . . . The whole affair was so confused that one grows weary of seeking to locate the blame." Barker in *THE QUARTERLY*, XIII, 259, says, "Austin's part was an important one. He gave Edwards sage advice which, if he had followed it, would have enabled him to avoid most of his trouble; and in the end took the only possible course to preserve the confidence of the government and the interests of the colonists." Miss Rather in *THE QUARTERLY*, VIII, 112, explains the DeWitt colony's opposition to the Fredonians. For a brief account of the Fredonian Rebellion, see Howren, *THE QUARTERLY*, XVI, 382.

communications. Obregon in reporting the revolt to his government said that the Americans established in Texas never ceased disturbing the tranquility of Mexico. They considered themselves a colony of their fatherland, and expected to reunite themselves to it as soon as they could. They took their slaves where the laws did not permit slavery, and in order to save their property they broke away from Mexico. In view of the character of the people on the frontier he believed that the only way to maintain peace there was to allow no more American colonizers within the limits of Mexico, to fill the territory with vigorous and respectable Mexican people, and to establish a sufficient military force there to protect them. He was satisfied that the United States government had nothing to do with the affair; but compared this with similar revolts that had occurred earlier at Baton Rouge and in West Florida and had been preludes to the seizure of territories there.³⁵

On February 16, 1827, Obregon had an interview with the secretary of state on the matter. Clay had said that the president was infinitely sorry and wished him to convey to the Mexican government the friendly sentiments of the United States. Three days later Clay addressed to Obregon a formal note declaring:

Information having reached this city of disturbances in the province of Texas, adjoining the territory of the United States, which appear to threaten the peace of the United Mexican States, I hasten by the direction of the President to express to you the very great regret which he feels on account of the existence of those disturbances. The frankness which has ever characterized the government of the United States in all its intercourse with foreign powers and the friendly feelings which it cherishes for the welfare of the Republic of the United Mexican States supersede altogether any necessity for the assurance which, nevertheless, I take pleasure in giving that the government of the United States has not given the smallest countenance or encouragement to those disturbances. The President has directed orders to be conveyed to that portion of the military force of the United States which is stationed on the Mexican frontier to give no aid or succor of any kind to those who have taken arms against or may oppose the authority of the government.

³⁵Obregon to Secretario, 8 de Febrero and 10 de Febrero de 1827, MS. Rel. Ext. With these letters and others of earlier and later dates Obregon enclosed newspaper clippings giving reports of the revolt.

of the United Mexican States; and he will see the restoration of tranquillity with much satisfaction.³⁶

On February 21, 1827, Poinsett wrote telling the effect produced in Mexico when news reached there of the Nacogdoches revolt. In the debate in the Mexican congress members had not hesitated to express their opinion that the government of the United States "was privy to this movement, if indeed it had not encouraged it. The latter opinion is boldly avowed by the *Sol*, a paper extremely inimical to the interests of the United States." The congress had appropriated five hundred thousand dollars to put down the insurrection.³⁷ About two weeks later Poinsett wrote that the expedition against the insurgents in Texas had started for Vera Cruz whence it would sail for Matagorda, the rendezvous. It would consist of one thousand troops and would be joined by ten thousand others from the interior provinces. "A desire was manifested to evince on this occasion great promptness and energy, so as to prevent similar attempts being made elsewhere." In a conference which Poinsett had with President Victoria the latter had said he was satisfied the government of the United States had not encouraged the revolt; but expressed a desire that the president of the United States should give some public manifestation of his disapprobation.³⁸ The troops intended for Texas were assembled in Vera Cruz, and although word came of the collapse of the revolt, still they prepared to go to the Texas coast to guard against similar outbreaks. The large force of provincial troops were not to join them, however, as originally planned. But the expedition got no

³⁶Obregon to Secretario, 17 de Febrero, and 21 de Febrero de 1827, the latter enclosing a copy of Clay to Obregon, Feb. 19, 1827, quoted above, also Obregon to Clay, 20 de Febrero de 1827, politely acknowledging Clay's of the preceding day; all in MS. Rel. Ext.

³⁷Poinsett to Clay, Feb. 21, 1827, MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., II. Early in February the Mexican foreign office had told Poinsett of a raid by Anglo-Americans on Nacogdoches Nov. 22, 1826. After some depredations they had left, declaring they would return on December 15. Poinsett replied that he would transmit this complaint to his government and felt sure that the aggressors would be punished. On receiving it Clay returned a copy of orders to the military authorities on the border which he said he believed would put a stop to the offense and secure the punishment of the guilty. Espinosa to Poinsett, Feb. 2, 1827; Poinsett to Espinosa, Feb. 4, 1827; Poinsett to Clay, Feb. 7, 1827; MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., II; and Clay to Poinsett, March 24, 1827, MS. Dept. of St., Instr., XI, 283.

³⁸Poinsett to Clay, March 8, 1827, MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., II.

further than Vera Cruz. The state government endeavored to make use of them to resist the national authority; and in June the central authorities recalled them to Mexico City.³⁹

Although Adams and Clay in the note of February 19, quoted above, distinctly disavowed for the government any connection or sympathy with the revolt in Texas, yet they appeared ready to take advantage of the event to see if it had produced the change in sentiment at Mexico which Poinsett had predicted. Clay wrote on March 15, 1827, that the numerous and extensive grants of land by the Mexican authorities

to citizens of the United States in the province of Texas authorize the belief that but little value is placed upon the possession of that province by that government. These grants seem to have been made without any sort of equivalent, judging according to our opinions of the value of land. They have been made to, and apparently in contemplation of being settled by, citizens from the United States. These emigrants will carry with them our principles of law, liberty, and religion; and however much it might be hoped that they might be disposed to amalgamate with the ancient inhabitants of Mexico, so far as political freedom is concerned, it would be almost too much to expect that all collisions would be avoided on other subjects. Already some of these collisions have manifested themselves, and others, in the progress of time, may be anticipated with confidence. These collisions may insensibly enlist the sympathies and feelings of the two republics and lead to misunderstandings.

The fixation of a line of boundary of the United States on the side of Mexico, should be such as to secure, not merely certainty and apparent safety in the respective limits of the two countries, but the consciousness of freedom from all danger of attack on either side, and the removal of all motives for such attack. That of the Sabine brings Mexico nearer our great commercial capital than is desirable; and although we now are, and for a long time may remain, perfectly satisfied with the justice and moderation of our neighbor, still it would be better for both parties that neither should feel that he is in any condition of exposure on the remote contingency of an alteration in existing friendly sentiments.

Impressed with these views, the President has thought the present might be an auspicious period for urging a negotiation, at Mexico, to settle the boundary between the territories of the two republics. The success of the negotiation will probably be pro-

³⁹Poinsett to Clay, March 24, June 5, June 16, and June 20, 1827. MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., II.

moted by throwing into it other motives than those which strictly belong to the subject itself. If we could obtain such a boundary as we desire, the Government of the United States might be disposed to pay a reasonable pecuniary consideration. The boundary which we prefer is that which, beginning at the mouth of the Rio del Norte in the sea, shall ascend that river to the mouth of the Rio Puerco, thence ascending this river to its source, and from its source, by a line due north, to strike the Arkansas, thence following the course of the southern bank of the Arkansas to its source, in latitude 42° north,⁴⁰ and thence by that parallel of latitude to the South sea. The boundary thus described would, according to the United States Tanner's map, published in the United States, leave Santa Fé within the limits of Mexico and the whole of Red River or Rio Roxo and the Arkansas, as far up as it is probably navigable, within the limits assigned to the United States. If that boundary be unattainable, we would, as the next most desirable, agree to that of the Colorado, beginning at its mouth, in the bay of Bernardo, and ascending the river to its source, and thence by a line due north to the Arkansas, and thence, as above traced, to the South sea. This latter boundary would probably also give us the whole of the Red River, would throw us somewhat farther from Santa Fé, but it would strike the Arkansas possibly at a navigable point. To obtain the first-described boundary, the President authorizes you to offer to the Government of Mexico a sum not exceeding one million of dollars. If you find it impracticable to procure that line, you are then authorized to offer, for the above line of the Colorado, the sum of five hundred thousand dollars. If either of the above offers should be accepted, you may stipulate for the payment of the sum of money, as you may happen to agree, within any period not less than three months after the exchange at the city of Washington of the ratifications of the treaty.

Then follow instructions for stipulating, in case of success, that there should be common navigation of and common jurisdiction over the boundary river; that bona fide land grants should be confirmed; that the inhabitants should be given full rights as United States citizens; and that the delivery of the territory should be simultaneous with the payment of the consideration. A copy was

⁴⁰This error which was commonly made was due to looseness of statement rather than to ignorance. The treaty of 1819 used this language but added "if the source of the Arkansas river shall be found to fall north or south of latitude forty-two, then the line shall be run from the said source due south or north, as the case may be, till it meets the said parallel, etc."

enclosed of Clay's note to Obregon of February 19, "in order to put you in possession of what has occurred here, and to enable you to efface any impression, should such exist at Mexico, that the United States have given countenance to the insurrection."⁴¹

That Adams and Clay were in hearty accord in this attempt to purchase Texas cannot be doubted. On the day preceding that on which the instruction was sent, the former entered in his diary that the latter "spoke of a draft he had some time since submitted of an instruction to Poinsett to propose to the Mexican Government the purchase of the province of Texas to the Rio del Norte or the Colorado. I asked him to let me see the draft again." The next day he entered the statement that Clay "read his instruction to Poinsett to propose the purchase of Texas. I advised him to leave out the offer of ships of war, and offer only money."⁴² In his long speech, or rather series of speeches, several years later on the Texas question and the right of petition, Adams cited this instruction, but did not dwell on the motive.⁴³ He declared that previous to this time he had uniformly favored acquiring Texas, saying: "I had myself, in the negotiation of our treaty with Spain, labored to get the Rio del Norte as our boundary, and I adhered to the demand till Mr. Monroe and all his cabinet directed me to forego it."⁴⁴

⁴¹Clay to Poinsett, March 15, 1827, MS. Dept. of St., Instr., XI, 270; extract in *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 1s., No. 42. p. 8, and *B. and F. St. P.*, XXVI, 837. See Rives, *U. S. and Mex.*, I, 169.

⁴²Adams, *Memoirs*, March 14 and 15, 1827, VII, 239, 240.

⁴³Adams, "Texas Speech" in *H. of R.*, 1838, 107. He said this offer was found to be highly disagreeable to Mexico, so was not pressed.

⁴⁴Adams's speech of April 15, 1842, Niles, *Register*, LXII, 138. In this speech he argued that because he wished Texas in 1825 and 1827 when slavery had been abolished there and could not have been restored had it been acquired, was no reason why he should be criticised for opposing the acquisition of Texas later.

For brief studies of the attempt to purchase Texas in 1827, see Barker, "Jackson and the Texas Revolution," *American Historical Review*, XII, 788; Reeves, *Diplomacy under Tyler and Polk*, 63; Garrison, *Westward Extension*, 87; Bancroft, *History of Mexico*, V, 155; Von Holst, *U. S. (1828-1846)*, 554; McMaster, *United States*, V, 460; Yoakum in *Comp. Hist. of Tex.*, I, 135; Kennedy, *Texas*, I, 370; Jay, *Review of Mexican War*, 13; Robinson, *Mexico and her Military Chieftains*, 144. Most of these say Poinsett did not present the proposal to the Mexican government, citing Clay's "Raleigh Letter" of 1844, Niles, *Reg.*, LXVI, 152, which says Poinsett "forebore even to make an overture for that purpose." No serious

When Poinsett received Clay's proposal to buy Texas he wrote: "I fear the sum offered for the territory is too small. The expenses of the government are so great that they don't regard so insignificant a sum as a million as of much use to them."⁴⁵ However he cautiously approached the Mexican government on the subject a few days later. On May 19, 1827, he wrote the secretary of foreign relations saying that the fortunate settlement of the difficulties in Texas suggested the importance of settling as early as possible and in a permanent manner the boundaries between the two countries. He added that he had been instructed by his government to call attention to this fact and say that he was fully empowered to treat on the subject.⁴⁶ Some time later he again cautiously approached the Mexican authorities on the subject, this time definitely suggesting the idea of purchase, though not in an official manner. Early in the next year he wrote Clay:

I have taken great pains to ascertain what prospect of success there would be of the Congress ratifying the treaty if I could have prevailed upon the plenipotentiaries to alter the limits in the manner suggested by you, and am convinced that the attempt would fail and only excite an unfriendly feeling. I have therefore abandoned it altogether. In a private conversation with one of the plenipotentiaries, I hinted at a remuneration in money to the Mexican government as an inducement to extend our boundary to the Rio del Norte; but he assured me it would be impossible to obtain either the consent of the government or of the Congress to such a measure, because it would be considered a dismemberment of the Mexican territory, which is prohibited by the constitution. If both governments should fix upon the Rio del Norte or any other point as the limits of the republics, the state of Texas would have no right to complain; but the general government could not sell any part of that state to us without violating the constitution and the legitimate rights of Texas.⁴⁷

regular negotiation was undertaken but Poinsett did sound the authorities on the subject. Adams, *Memoirs*, XI, 365, says the offer was rejected.

⁴⁵Poinsett to Clay, May 10, 1827, MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., III. See Reeves, *Diplomacy under Tyler and Polk*, 64.

⁴⁶Poinsett to Sec. of St. of Mex., May 19, 1827, MS. Rel. Ext.

⁴⁷Poinsett to Clay, Jan. 8, 1828, MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., III. The above portion of this letter is omitted in the extract printed in *H. Ex. H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 1s., No. 42, p. 24; *B and F. St. P.*, XXVI, 841.

It is interesting to notice that the Mexican negotiator based his argument for the unconstitutionality of the sale of Texas on the doctrine of

Apart from these two very cautious attempts of Poinsett to open negotiations for carrying out Clay's instructions of March 15, 1827, for the purchase of Texas, nothing of importance on the subject of limits passed between the two governments from that time until the beginning of the following year. In the meantime the Mexican commission to examine the country near the proposed boundary had completed its slow preparations and started to the scene of its labors. The two years which Poinsett had said would be necessary to complete the work, if a joint commission were sent as Alaman proposed, had more than passed before the Mexican commission started from the City of Mexico. In July, 1826, Poinsett wrote that a commission had been appointed and that General Mier y Teran had been placed at its head. That gentleman had told Poinsett that he expected to start in September of the same year; but the latter supposed his departure would not take place before October.⁴⁸ It did not. Neither did it occur for more than a year later than that. On September 6, 1827, the Mexican congress appropriated fifteen thousand dollars to defray the expenses of the commission.⁴⁹ A month later Poinsett wrote Clay that the commission had still not departed because the money was not in the treasury, and he was still trying to convince the government of the uselessness of the mission till the treaty had settled the boundary.⁵⁰ But still they persisted; and the money was soon forthcoming. On November 10, 1827, the commission started from the City of Mexico. Almost four months later it arrived at Bexar, March 1, 1828, and was ready to begin its work.⁵¹

state rights. If the matter could have been submitted to a vote of the people of the state the difficulty would probably have disappeared. In 1829 Van Buren suggested that this be done.

⁴⁸Poinsett to Clay, July 12, 1826, MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., III; *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 1s., No. 42, p. 24; *B. and F. St. P.*, XXVI, 837.

⁴⁹Mexico, *Leyes, Decretos, y Ordenes que forman el Derecho Int.*, 139.

⁵⁰Poinsett to Clay, Oct. 6, 1827, MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., III; *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 1s., No. 42, p. 25; *B. and F. St. P.*, XXVI, 840.

⁵¹Berlandier y Chovel, *Diario de Viage de la Comision de Limites . . . bajo . . . Mier y Teran*, 7, 115. This seems to be a very much condensed and slightly changed translation of a manuscript in French by Berlandier filling seven octavo volumes on travels in Mexico and Texas between 1826 and 1834. This and a few other Berlandier manuscripts of interest in the history of Texas and the Mexican War have recently been purchased by the Library of Congress. Berlandier was the naturalist of the expedition, and his notes are of value chiefly from the scientific, especially the geographical standpoint.

At about this time there came into the Mexican foreign office two extensive reports tracing the history of the Louisiana-Texas boundary from a very early period in an effort to get at a historical basis for fixing the boundary.⁵² These seem to have strengthened the already existing determination of the government not to yield Texas or any portion of its territory.

Although the Mexican negotiators had repeatedly insisted that it would be necessary to have the information which the Teran commission was to gather before the treaty of limits could be concluded, yet it had hardly departed before preparations were made to renew the negotiations immediately,⁵³ and had hardly gotten half way to the scene of its labors when a treaty was signed. When the commercial treaty which had been concluded July 10, 1826, was considered by the Mexican Chamber of Deputies early in the next year, that chamber passed a resolution declaring it would not consider that treaty further until an article should be inserted recognizing the validity of the treaty of 1819 between the United States and Spain so far as it had to do with the boundary.⁵⁴ On January 8, 1828, after Poinsett had been trying in vain to induce the Mexican government to renew the negotiation for a commercial treaty (to take the place of that mentioned above, which the legislative bodies of both governments had refused to ratify), he wrote Clay that the Mexican negotiators had insisted that Mexico was

invested with all the rights of Spain and bound by all the obligations of the mother country . . . and in short declared that

The passport for General Teran which the Mexican government requested was delivered by Clay to Obregon on March 24, 1828. *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 1s., No. 42, p. 42; *B. and F. St. P.*, XXVI, 844.

⁵²One of these is the "Informe de Padre P. M. J. Puellas acerca de los limites de Texas," dated Zacatecas, Noviembre 28 de 1827, a report on documents in archives in that city on the subject, covering thirty-four pages. The other is "Extractos de la memoria del Padre Pichardo, y de los informes del Ministro y Consul de España en los Estados Unidos acerca de limites de Texas é invasiones en su territorio." The transcripts of these extracts cover fifty typewritten pages and review several hundred pages of manuscripts. MS. Rel. Ext.

⁵³Translation of Speech of Victoria to Congress, Dec. 24, 1827, MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., III.

⁵⁴Resolution of April 2, 1827, Mexico, *Trat. y Conv.*, I, 113; Poinsett to Clay, Jan. 8, 1828, MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., III; Extracts in *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 1s., No. 42, p. 26; *B. and F. St. P.*, XXVI, 841.

if I did not consent to comply with the resolution of the Chamber of Deputies it would be useless to discuss the other articles of the treaty, as it was certain that Congress would not ratify any treaty which did not contain such a provision. I withdrew my opposition; but observed that, as the treaty of navigation and commerce was for a limited period and that of limits perpetual, it would be better to make them distinct conventions, to which proposition the Mexican plenipotentiaries consented.

It was in this connection that Poinsett explained in cipher, as quoted above, his cautious hint to one of the negotiators that the United States was willing to purchase Texas. He concluded that cipher: "Believing, therefore, that any attempt to alter the former treaty of limits would prove ineffective and only excite unfriendly feelings, I shall accept the proposal of the Mexican plenipotentiaries and renew the treaty of Washington of 1819."⁵⁵

The first conference in the negotiation of the boundary treaty had occurred on the day on which Poinsett wrote the above explanation of his reasons for abandoning Texas. After the Mexican negotiators had explained their position Poinsett replied that,

although the limits as settled by the treaty of Washington were liable to some objections and might be altered advantageously for both parties as he had before frequently explained, still if the Government of Mexico insisted upon the execution of articles three and four of that treaty he could not object to it. . . . Any alteration of the treaty of Washington must depend upon the mutual consent of the present contracting parties.⁵⁶

In the second conference, which occurred on January 10, the negotiators agreed upon the preamble declaring the purpose of the treaty and the first article saying, "the two high contracting parties will proceed forthwith to carry into full effect the third and fourth

⁵⁵Poinsett to Clay, Jan. 8, 1828, cited in note 54.

The Mexican negotiators in explaining to the foreign office, said they believed the United States would not have attempted to change the boundary unless they had expected to gain an advantage at the expense of Mexico. Camacho and Esteva to Espinosa, 12 de Enero de 1828, Mexico, *Trat. y Conv.*, I, 114.

⁵⁶Protocol of first conference, Jan. 8, 1828, *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 1s., No. 42, p. 27; *B. and F., St. P.*, XXVI, 841; Mexico, *Trat. y Conv.*, I, 109. Enclosed with Poinsett to Clay, Feb. 7, 1828, MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., III.

articles of said treaty."⁵⁷ The second article of this treaty is in the exact words of the third article of the treaty of 1819; and the third article of this is the same as the fourth of that. The fourth and last article of this treaty says "the ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington within the term of four months, or sooner, if possible." On January 12, it was signed.⁵⁸

Thus after a deadlock of more than two years over the question of limits the treaty was negotiated and signed all within four days. But they who marry in haste repent at leisure. The four months designated within which ratifications should be exchanged afforded ample time in case action should be prompt; but it did not allow for much unnecessary delay, since it required approximately two months for a messenger to pass from Mexico to Washington. The conclusion of the boundary treaty had removed the obstacle to the negotiation of the treaty of amity, commerce, and navigation, which was signed almost exactly a month later. Since the two were complementary the former was held till the latter was ready. That the government at Washington might have time to consider the treaty of limits and be ready to ratify it within the time allowed Poinsett forwarded a copy of it on February 7, when he foresaw that the commercial treaty would soon be concluded.⁵⁹ On February 22 his messenger set out from the City of Mexico bearing the official signed copies of both treaties, that of limits of January 12, and that of amity and commerce of February 14, 1828.⁶⁰

In Poinsett's letter of February 7, cited above, he gave some reasons for his abandoning Texas in addition to those explained in his letter of a month earlier. He said:

This government and people have been kept purposely in a continual state of excitement upon this very delicate question. We have been represented by the agents of certain European powers

⁵⁷Protocol of second conference, Jan. 10, 1828, *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 1s., No. 42, p. 28; *B. and F. St. P.*, XXVI, 843; Mexico, *Trat. y Conv.*, I, 110, 112.

⁵⁸For treaty see *Am. St. P., For.*, VI, 946; Mexico, *Trat. y Conv.*, I, 115, 117.

⁵⁹Poinsett to Clay, Feb. 7, 1828, MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., III; extracts in *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 1s., No. 42, p. 26; *Ibid.*, 2s., No. 351, p. 189; *B. and F. St. P.*, XXVI, 843.

⁶⁰Poinsett to Clay, Feb. 22, 1828, MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., III; *Am. St. P., For.*, VI, 948; *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 2s., No. 351, p. 190.

as the natural enemies of Mexico; and our desire to make alterations in the treaty of limits concluded with Spain and to deprive them of a portion of their territory was constantly urged in proof of our bad faith and insatiable ambition. It became necessary, therefore, for me to use very cautious language upon this subject, and in all my conversations and notes in relation to the question of limits to endeavor, if any change were made, that it should be at the suggestion of this government, so that the honorable dealing of the United States in this respect might at all times be manifest.⁶¹

The Adams administration was apparently fully convinced by these two letters of Poinsett that it was useless to attempt longer to obtain Texas. Neither was there any considerable opposition in the Senate. Action was as prompt as could be desired. On April 21 Clay wrote Poinsett that the latter's messenger had arrived with the treaties and that they would be immediately laid before the Senate for their advice and consent.⁶² On the same day the treaty of limits was transmitted to the Senate by President Adams,⁶³ and referred by that body to its committee on foreign relations.⁶⁴ One week later that committee reported it back without amendment; the committee of the whole considered it at once, also without amending, and reported it to the Senate; and that body immediately proceeded by unanimous consent to consider the resolution to advise and consent to its ratification, and approved the resolution, thirty-eight yeas to three nays.⁶⁵ Two days later, April 30, 1828, Clay wrote Obregon, the Mexican minister in Washington, "I am ready to proceed in the exchange of the ratifications of the treaty at any time that may suit your convenience within the period prescribed," reminding him that only a few days remained.⁶⁶ On May 1 Obregon acknowledged Clay's note of the day before, but expressed his regret that he did not have it in his

⁶¹Poinsett to Clay, Feb. 7, 1828, as cited in note 59. This very interesting portion of this letter is not printed in any of the three extracts from it cited in the same note.

⁶²Clay to Poinsett, April 21, 1828, MS. Dept. of St., Instr., XII, 98; *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 2s., No. 351, p. 17.

⁶³*Am. St. P., For.*, VI, 946.

⁶⁴*Senate Ex. Jour.*, III, 604.

⁶⁵*Ibid.*, 605. Those opposing were Benton, Ellis, and Smith of South Carolina.

⁶⁶Clay to Obregon, April 30, 1828, *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 1s., No. 42, p. 46; *B. and F. St. P.*, XXVI, 846.

power to effect the exchange immediately, and explained that he had not yet received the ratification by his own government.⁶⁷ There remained eleven days before the time set for exchanging the ratifications would expire.

In Mexico, on the other hand, action on the treaty was very different. Poinsett reported on April 24 that its progress had been delayed by the extreme indolence of the man who had been secretary of state. He had kept the treaty for more than two months without presenting it to congress, although Poinsett had warned him repeatedly of the prejudice to Mexican interests caused by the delay.⁶⁸ It had to be acted on by both houses of the Mexican congress. The lower house had ratified it before Poinsett wrote this letter of April 24,⁶⁹ and two days later he wrote that the Senate had ratified it. The action of congress, he said, was prompt enough but it was impossible to get it to Washington in time to exchange the ratifications before the four months' time limit should expire.⁷⁰ In spite of this the Mexican ratifications were transmitted to Obregon with instructions to effect the exchange, and that minister notified Clay on August 2, 1828, that he had just received them and was ready to effect the exchange when convenient to the United States government; but was informed that since the time limit had expired it would have to be laid before the Senate again at the next session to get its approval before the exchange could be effected.⁷¹

Although Poinsett's advances had been very guarded and he had not really made any offer to purchase Texas, yet the fact that

⁶⁷Obregon to Clay, May 1, 1828, *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 1s., No. 42, p. 46; *B. and F. St. P.*, XXVI, 846.

⁶⁸Espinosa who had been secretary of state for foreign relations nearly two years was succeeded by Cañedo on March 8, 1828. See Bocanegra, *Memorias*, I, 557. This was not quite two months after signing the treaty. Had the new secretary and both houses of congress acted as promptly as the authorities at Washington there still would have been time.

⁶⁹Poinsett to Clay, April 24, 1828, MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., IV; *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 1s., No. 42, p. 28; *B. and F. St. P.*, XXVI, 845.

⁷⁰Poinsett to Clay, April 26, 1828, MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., IV; *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 1s., No. 42, p. 29; *B. and F. St. P.*, XXVI, 845.

⁷¹Obregon to Clay, Aug. 2, 1828, and Brent to Obregon, same date, *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 1s., No. 42, p. 47, 48; *B. and F. St. P.*, XXVI, 846, 847. On May 10 Cañedo had informed Poinsett of the ratification by his government. *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 2s., No. 351, p. 202. For brief discussion of this treaty and its failure, see Rives, *U. S. and Mex.*, I, 170.

the United States wished and was endeavoring to do so became known, since, as Poinsett said, there were no secrets in Mexico. Greatly exaggerated reports concerning the matter reached European courts. In the middle of the year 1828, Rocafuerte, the Mexican representative in London, wrote his government that a rumor was current in diplomatic circles there to the effect that Mexico had already ceded Texas to the United States for the sum of thirty-five million pesos; and that this was the result of the scandalous intrigues of the minister of the United States at the Mexican capital. He said he could not believe it, but neither could he deny it.⁷² As soon as Rocafuerte's letter reached Mexico his government instructed him to deny the rumor at once, since it was utterly without foundation.⁷³

In the latter part of this year 1828, a curious request for the cession of Texas reached the Mexican government from a very different source and for a very different purpose. It came from London but not from the British government. It is of small importance but of considerable interest. Robert Owen, the well known socialistic philanthropist, presented through Rocafuerte a request that the government of Mexico should cede to him the state of Coahuila and Texas as a place where he might work out his philanthropic plans for the benefit of all mankind. He proposed that it should be an entirely independent state, and that its independence should be guaranteed by Mexico, the United States and Great Britain. As the chief consideration other than the philanthropic ones which should induce Mexico to grant his request, he argued,

That it is a frontier province between the Mexican and North American republics which is now settling under such circumstances as are likely to create jealousies and irritations between citizens of these states and which most probably at some future period will terminate in a war between the two republics. This consideration alone, in the opinion of many experienced statesmen, would render it a wise measure in the Mexican republic to place this province under the new arrangements about to be proposed.

The elaboration of his plans fills eight typewritten pages. In

⁷²Rocafuerte to Secretario, Londres, 16 de Julio de 1828, MS, Rel. Ext.

⁷³[Secretario to Rocafuerte], 22 de Septiembre de 1828, MS, Rel. Ext.

Rocafuerte's letter transmitting the memorial he said he had told Owen there was not the slightest prospect of the government's granting the request, for, "although it is very beautiful, very plausible, and very philanthropic on paper it is unrealizable in practice."⁷⁴

Numerous notes passed between Poinsett and the Mexican government concerning difficulties arising out of the operation of a law which had been passed in September, 1823, allowing goods intended for consumption in Texas to come in duty free for seven years. Poinsett presented complaints that officials were not allowing this privilege. Cañedo declared an erroneous interpretation had been placed on the law, that there were many frauds practiced, and that to prevent these it had been ordered that all goods should pay the duty, but that afterwards reimbursements should be made for goods proved to have been used in Texas. The privilege was still abused and merchants of Monclova complained because they no longer had the benefit of it. Poinsett argued with the Mexican officials that the lax enforcement of the law by the Mexican authorities on the coast had encouraged merchants of the United States to engage in this trade and they should not be made to suffer by the sudden withdrawal of the privilege. He attempted to have time allowed to notify shippers. But an order was issued in April, 1828, to treat as contrabandists all who attempted to land goods under the law. Poinsett informed Clay, April 23, 1828, that the Mexican government had decided to put a stop immediately to the free entry of goods for consumption by the inhabitants of Texas.⁷⁵

In the absence of treaty stipulations for the purpose there was

⁷⁴Rocafuerte to Secretario, Londres, 15 de Julio de 1828, and Owen's memorial accompanying, MS. Rel. Ext.

⁷⁵Poinsett to Secretario, Sept. 10, 1827, MS. Rel. Ext.; Cañedo to Poinsett, April 8, 1828; Poinsett to Cañedo, April 11, 1828; Cañedo to Poinsett, April 21, 1828; all enclosures with Poinsett to Clay, July 15, 1828, MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., IV; Poinsett to Clay, April 23, 1828, MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., III. The last cited is printed in *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 2s., No. 351, p. 201.

Bancroft, *N. Mex. Sts. and Tex.*, II, 114, says the exemption expired in 1830. This is the time it would have legally expired had it not been withdrawn. He probably follows Filisola, *Memorias*, I, 163, which says: "al acabar aquel mismo año de 1830 debian terminar las escenciones y privilegios concedidos á las distritos de Tejas, Monclova, y Rio Grande, para la introduccion libre de derechos de todo lo que necesitasen para el uso de aquellos habitantes."

no regular means for the recovery by the United States of absconding debtors, runaway slaves, and escaped criminals who had taken refuge in Mexican territory. Clay wrote Poinsett in January, 1828, that information had come to Washington to the effect that impediments were placed in the way of recovering such, especially in Texas. A resolution of the House of Representatives had assumed the existence of such impediments and called on the President for information regarding the matter. Obregon had declared that he knew of no such obstacles. Poinsett was instructed to make inquiries and in case he found that such existed he was to protest against them.⁷⁶ In April, 1828, Clay instructed Poinsett to ask the surrender of several persons named Hardin who were charged with having committed an atrocious murder in Tennessee and had fled to Texas. The treaties concluded and just received, he said, provided for such extradition, but since ratifications had not been exchanged it could not be demanded. On June 3 Poinsett presented the request. Expecting that there would be a long delay before the government decided what to do, he applied through a friend directly to the governor of the state of Coahuila and Texas, asking that the men be secured until the government should decide. But only three days after the request was presented Cañedo replied to Poinsett that the president had directed the governor of Coahuila and Texas to arrest and surrender the murderers. Later that governor wrote Poinsett directly that he would do so.⁷⁷

The Fredonian revolt that had collapsed so speedily early in 1827 was only the beginning of a series of disturbances in Texas during the following two years, which called for the exchange of numerous diplomatic notes. In August of 1827 Obregon wrote his government of another attack which it was reported would soon be made

⁷⁶Clay to Poinsett, Jan. 12, 1828, MS. Dept. of St., Instr., XII, 53; Clay to Adams, Jan. 14, 1828, and Adams to H. of R., Jan. 15, 1828, *Am. St. P., For.*, VI, 822.

⁷⁷Clay to Poinsett, April 21, 1828, MS. Dept. of St., Instr., XII, 98; *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 2s., No. 351, p. 17; *ibid.*, pp. 18-32 are the documents containing the charges against the Hardins; Poinsett to Cañedo, June 3, 1828, Cañedo to Poinsett, June 7, 1828, Poinsett to Clay, July 12, 1828, MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., IV. The last letter is printed in *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 2s., No. 351, p. 214. Poinsett to Clay, June 9, 1828, MS. U. S. Embassy Archives, Mexico. This last is missing in the files of the Dept. of State.

on Nacogdoches by a band who had set out from New Orleans under the guise of a surveying party going to mark out a grant of land that had been made in Texas, but upon reaching the border had assumed a warlike aspect and were planning the descent on Nacogdoches with the assistance of the Cherokee Indians.⁷⁸ In October of the same year he wrote that there was talk of the United States taking control of the disorderly Mexican territory south of the Red River, to prevent the Indians residing there from making attacks on citizens of the United States north of that river. Obregon advised his government to take steps to prevent this.⁷⁹ In April of 1828 Cañedo complained to Poinsett that a party of fifteen men from the United States had made an irruption into Texas and at Nacogdoches had declared themselves the advance guard of a republican army consisting of several hundred which was going to march on Bexar or Guadalupe. Poinsett replied promptly that he would submit the matter to his government and ask that measures be taken to prevent such movements.⁸⁰ Indians were causing trouble by attacking each other across the border. In July, 1828, Cañedo called Poinsett's attention to the fact that the Comanche Indians living in Mexican territory had asked permission to pursue and recover property that had been taken from them by Indians from the United States who had returned thither. The request was denied through respect for the territory of a friendly state.⁸¹

About the middle of the year 1828 reports reached the government in Mexico that Spanish refugees in New Orleans were planning to co-operate with the Spanish authorities in Cuba in an expedition to the Texas coast. Orders were at once despatched to the governor of Coahuila and Texas to remove all Spaniards from

⁷⁸Obregon to Secretario, 10 de Agosto de 1827, MS. Rel. Ext.

⁷⁹Same to same, 13 de Octubre de 1827, *ibid.*

⁸⁰Cañedo to Poinsett, April 12, 1828, Poinsett to Cañedo, April 19, 1828, enclosures with Poinsett to Clay, July 14, 1828, MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., IV. In Poinsett to Clay, April 23, 1828, MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., III and *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 2s., No. 351, p. 201, mention is made of this raid; and also of the violation of Mexican sovereignty by a party of one hundred hunters near the northern limit of California. Poinsett explained that this was probably due to ignorance of the exact location of the line.

⁸¹Cañedo to Poinsett, July 15, 1828, enclosed with Poinsett to Clay, July 16, 1828, MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., IV; *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 2s., No. 351, p. 242.

the coast as soon as the expedition should approach; and a secret agent was sent to New Orleans to keep the government informed. That agent reported in September that there certainly had been talk of such a movement early in the year; but the schemers had neither sufficient men nor money. Their chief, José Lara, had gone to Cuba, expecting a reward for his zeal. In November the same secret agent reported a still more visionary movement. This was led by a Spanish officer who had been expelled from Mexico. He was trying to incite the poorest of his countrymen and some Mexicans of the same class to join him in a disorderly plundering raid. He assured them they could collect a hundred and fifty or two hundred men, go to Texas and proclaim the devil, if they wanted to, surprise some settlements, and get away with what they could carry.⁸² These movements amounted to nothing and would not deserve serious notice in themselves; but the Mexican authorities were unduly alarmed at them and they had no little influence on the rising tide of hostility in Mexico for the United States which so deeply affected the diplomatic relations. Similar reports continued through 1828 and 1829, from agents both in New Orleans and in Texas, especially from General Teran, who was near the border as head of the boundary commission. On July 29, 1829, Bocanegra, who was then secretary of state for foreign affairs, wrote Poinsett that he was instructed by President Guerrero to communicate intelligence just received from New Orleans. It was to the effect that José Lara was enlisting men in New Orleans under a commission from the government of Havana, and that he had already sent to that government more than four hundred recruits. It was also reported that at several places along the border United States troops were being collected and drilled and supplies collected. He asked that these acts in violation of neutrality and in aid of the Spanish expedition against Mexico be prevented.⁸³ Two days after receiving this Poinsett made a spirited reply, declaring that the vigilant execution of the laws in the

⁸²Pedraza to Secretario, 22 de Julio de 1828, Secretario to Pedraza, 26 de Julio de 1828, Secretario to Gobernador de Coah. y Tex., 26 de Julio de 1828, Gobernador de Coah. y Tex. to Secretario, 11 de Agosto de 1828, Secretario de Rel. to Secretario de Guerra, 27 de Agosto de 1828, Martinez to Secretario, Nueva Orleans, 23 de Septiembre de 1828, same to same 17 de Noviembre de 1828, all in MS. Rel. Ext.

⁸³Bocanegra to Poinsett, July 29, 1829, MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., IV.

United States against foreign enlistment made incredible such things as Bocanegra said were going on in New Orleans. He ventured to suggest that Lara was doing no more than transport to Cuba Spaniards expelled from Mexico who were unable to support themselves and were willing to take advantage of the offer made by the Captain General of Cuba of refuge and support in that island. He declared also that he had no knowledge of such military preparations on the border as Bocanegra had mentioned, except from statements published in libelous papers in Mexico by enemies of the liberties of America who were striving to disturb the friendly relations between the two republics. They had no foundation in fact. He said if Spain attacked Mexico the United States would remain neutral; but would be friendly and sympathetic with Mexico.⁸⁴ In reporting to Van Buren, the secretary of state in the new Jackson administration, this correspondence with Bocanegra, Poinsett said the conduct of the Mexican government with reference to all foreign nations was ridiculous and ought only to excite our compassion. They regarded Mexico as the most favored nation on earth and thought all others were jealous of her, especially the United States. He said General Teran had never ceased to arouse the fears of the government regarding the attitude of the United States toward Texas; and frequent insinuations by Europeans of American designs on Texas confirmed these fears. He had seen a letter of June 3 from Teran, "who has always been attached to the English interests. This person assures the government in his last despatches that we are making vast preparations to attack that country and have already fifteen thousand men on the frontier." Teran enlarged on the great size, fertility and natural resources of Texas, and the consequent reasons why Mexico should never yield possession.⁸⁵ Another note from Bocanegra on August 20 telling of more positive announcements of military preparations in the United States against Mexico elicited the next day pointed denials from Poinsett and renewed declarations of the friendly disposition of the United States for Mexico. He said he thought the agents of the government gave too easy credence to false statements. In reporting this correspondence to Van Buren

⁸⁴Poinsett to Bocanegra, July 31, 1829, *ibid.*

⁸⁵Poinsett to Van Buren, Aug. 2, 1829, *ibid.*

Poinsett said he had declared in a conference with Bocanegra on the subject that until the treaty of amity and commerce should be ratified military movements on the frontiers must be expected. The treaty contained a provision for restraining the Indians on the border. He had said that if Mexico did not restrain her Indians from attacks on the United States side, the United States would pursue such tribes for punishment even to the gates of Mexico. In the beginning of this letter to Van Buren Poinsett explained that the Mexican Senate had addressed to Bocanegra an insolent demand for information regarding the reported activities of the United States, and Poinsett believed that body wanted to plunge the country into war with the United States hoping that would overthrow the existing state of things in Mexico. He declared, "I will not therefore suffer myself to be provoked; nor will I personally yield to their attacks, although my residence in this country has become almost insupportable."⁸⁶

It will be recalled that it was the second of August, 1828, when Obregon was told that the ratifications of the boundary treaty of January 12, 1828, could not be exchanged till that treaty should again be acted on by the Senate of the United States at the next session, because the four months' time limit had expired.⁸⁷ This necessarily delayed the matter till the following winter. But action was not taken even then. In the middle of April of the following year Montoya, the Mexican chargé at Washington, brought the matter to the attention of the new Jackson administration by saying in a letter to Van Buren that he presumed the treaty had been presented to the Senate as had been said would be necessary, and asking whether the secretary of state was now ready to proceed with the exchange of the ratifications, explaining that the Mexican government, desirous of effecting the exchange, had invested him with full powers for the purpose. Van Buren replied that he was not fully informed as to the reasons why the preceding administration had not again submitted the treaty of limits to the Senate; but supposed it was because

⁸⁶Bocanegra to Poinsett, Aug. 20, 1829, Poinsett to Bocanegra, Aug. 21, 1829, Poinsett to Van Buren, Aug. 22, 1829, MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., IV; all of these except the important beginning of the last are in *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 2s., No. 351, p. 291-294.

⁸⁷See above p. 244.

Mexican action on the commercial treaty was expected and it was desired to have the Senate act on the two together, and this expectation had been disappointed. It would be necessary still to submit the treaty to the Senate to be acted on again, and he promised that it should be submitted at the next session. In the meantime he hoped the Mexican ratifications of the commercial treaty would arrive so the two could be submitted to the Senate together.⁸⁸ Again the exchange was delayed, this time for the most of a year. But before this time was gone the new administration had determined to try its hand at negotiating a new treaty of limits which should supersede the other and give Texas to the United States.

Early in March of 1829 in reviewing at length, for the information of the new administration, the whole of his diplomatic activities and difficulties in Mexico, Poinsett discussed very briefly the boundary negotiations;⁸⁹ again in July he reviewed his negotiations for the treaties, tracing those for the treaty of limits to the conclusion of the pending treaty a year and a half earlier, and concluded by declaring: "I am still convinced that we never can expect to extend our boundary south of the river Sabine, without quarreling with these people, and driving them to court a more strict alliance with some European power."⁹⁰ This renewed assertion of Poinsett's belief that it would never be possible to secure Texas peaceably did not reach the Department of State until nearly a month after the new administration had matured its project for the acquisition of Texas and despatched instructions for the purpose. It is doubtful whether it would have affected the situation, even had it arrived before the instructions were sent. The plan seems to have developed slowly. Nearly six months of Jackson's term was gone before it took shape. The earliest documentary evidence of the growth of the plan which is preserved in the cor-

⁸⁸Montoya to Van Buren, April 16, 1829, and Van Buren to Montoya, April 22, 1829, *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 1s., No. 42, p. 49; *B. and F. St. P.*, XXVI, 848.

⁸⁹Poinsett to Sec. of St., March 10, 1829, MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., IV.

⁹⁰Poinsett to Van Buren, July 22, 1829, MS. Dept. of St., Mex., Desp., IV; *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 1s., No. 42, p. 29, prints a brief extract and the rest is in *Ibid.*, 2s., No. 351, p. 285. This was received at the Dept. of St. Sept. 22.

response of Van Buren is a report of Anthony Butler. It is not dated but seems to have been presented about August 11, 1829, since a letter from Jackson of the following day says, "I am pleased with the document you sent me respecting Texas, and will be happy to see you and Col. Butler whenever it may suit your convenience." That this was not the origin of the project is evident from Butler's opening his report with the statement, "In negotiating for Texas a variety of considerations present themselves," and his reference later to the "anticipated negotiation." He discusses at considerable length the soil, climate, resources, and water ways of Texas and the value of the province to the United States. "The considerations which present themselves" he discusses under seven heads. In Van Buren's instructions he embodied nearly every suggestion which Butler here makes. In addition to his arguments Butler adds a gentle appeal to personal ambition by suggesting that the people of the south and west are so vitally interested in the matter "as to secure for that man who may accomplish the recovery of Texas their thanks, their confidence, and their gratitude," which, he adds, is likely hereafter to amount to something more than complimentary toasts or newspaper eulogisms. Jackson's letter referred to above shows that they had been studying with some care Poinsett's explanations of the reasons why the offer to purchase Texas in 1827 had failed, for he says that the constitutional question can be solved; two million added to the one million offered will amend the Mexican constitution. Another document which seems to have had a marked influence in shaping the final instructions is an unsigned and undated "Project for the acquisition of [the] province of Texas" which sets forth the motive for the negotiation by saying, "To counteract the evils growing out of the surrender of that part of Louisiana west of the Sabine and east of the Rio del Norte or Grand River, it is proposed to open a negotiation for the retrocession of the same to the United States." It gives several suggestions as to how Poinsett might approach the Mexican government and says the present threatened invasion of Mexico by Spain and the deranged condition of the finances "makes the time a very propitious one for the ascertainment of her views in regard to this territory as Mr. P. can give his enquiries the character of individual solicitude for her welfare and

a desire to relieve her embarrassments rather than turn them to the advantage of his own country." On August 13 Jackson made a rough outline draft of the instructions to be given to Poinsett. With these various documents as a basis Van Buren prepared first a rough outline draft and then the complete instructions which were dated August 25, 1829.⁹¹

These instructions begin by saying: "It is the wish of the President that you should, without delay, open a negotiation with the Mexican government for the purchase of so much of the province of Texas as is hereinafter described, or for such a part thereof as they can be induced to cede to us." The President was convinced of the necessity of the proposed acquisition in order to guard the western frontier, protect New Orleans, and secure the undisturbed possession of the valley of the Mississippi River with all its tributaries. "The boundary at present assumed by Mexico is deemed objectionable" for various reasons which he sets forth. There was some uncertainty as to which of two streams emptying into Sabine Bay was the true Sabine River. Whichever it should be, that river was navigable only by small vessels and never would sustain sufficient commerce to warrant the maintenance there of custom houses, without which it would be "impossible to prevent that frontier from

⁹¹Butler to Secretary of State, [Aug. 11, 1829]; Jackson to Van Buren, Aug. 12, 1829; "Project for [the] acquisition of the province of Texas" [Aug. 13, 1829]; Jackson's draft of instructions to Poinsett, Aug. 13, 1829; Van Buren's outline draft, 16 pp.; First draft in different hands with numerous corrections and containing practically everything in the final instructions, 32 pp.; Second draft dated Aug. 25, 1829, 37 pp.; all in Van Buren MSS., Library of Congress, IX and X. The conjectured dates have been adopted from the Library of Congress *Calendar of the Van Buren papers* prepared by W. C. Ford and Miss Elizabeth West and printed in 1910. Jackson's draft of Aug. 13, is printed in Reeves, *Diplomacy under Tyler and Polk*, 65 note, citing the Jackson papers, which seems to be an error.

Most writers on Texas history discuss these instructions of Aug. 25, 1829, and in connection with them mention the offer to purchase made by Clay on March 15, 1827, and his instructions to Poinsett on March 26, 1825, to negotiate for a westward extension of the boundary. See Howren, *THE QUARTERLY*, XVI, 383-387; Barker, "Jackson and the Texas Rev.," *A. H. R.*, XII, 789; McMaster, *U. S.*, V, 461 and 542-555, which dwells at great length on the efforts of the Jacksonian newspapers to facilitate the purchase; Kennedy, *Texas*, I, 372. The following five give very brief discussions: Bancroft, *N. Mex. Sts. and Tex.*, II, 89; MacDonall, *Jacksonian Democracy*, 211; Yoakum in *Comp. Hist. of Tex.*, I, 129; the remainder are strongly prejudiced: Von Holst, *U. S. (1828-1846)*, 555; Jay, *Review of Mex. War*, 15; Adams, "Texas Speech" in *H. of R.*, 1838, 114-121; Tornel, *Tejas y los Estados Unidos*, 3, 10; Filisola, *Memorias*, I, 158-162.

becoming the seat of an extensive system of smuggling." The lands east of the Sabine were poor and occupied by persons of an objectionable character who would continue to create incessant difficulties and broils which would foster and influence the "spirit of jealousy to which our neighbors are already too much inclined." His enumeration of the reasons which ought to induce Mexico to be willing to make the cession he begins by saying: "Nothing would be more adverse to the feelings of the President than to give that government reason to believe that he is capable of taking advantage of their necessities to obtain from them any portion of the Mexican territory, the cession of which would impair the true interests or commit the honor of that country." He then argues:

The comparatively small value of the territory in question to Mexico; its remote and disconnected situation; the unsettled condition of her affairs; the depressed and languishing state of her finances; and the still, and at this moment particularly, threatening attitude of Spain all combine to point out and recommend to Mexico the policy of parting with a portion of her territory of very limited and contingent benefit to supply herself with the means of defending the residue with the better prospect of success and with less onerous burdens to her citizens. It is for the federal government of Mexico, if they approve of the policy of doing so, to judge of their constitutional power to make the cession. It is believed that no doubt could exist on that account if the consent of the state of Coahuila were obtained; and if the view we take of the true interests of the republic of Mexico are not founded in error, it is supposed that such consent would not be withheld.

An argument which Poinsett was to use his judgment in suggesting was that the internal disturbances and revolutions of Mexico rendered a dissolution of the republic possible; and it was generally conceded that in such event Texas would be the first to strike a blow for independence, the example of which would endanger the unity of the rest. The aggressive character of the settlers on the United States side of the border; the settlement of adventurous persons in the prohibited zone on the Mexican side; and the lack of harmony between the non-Spanish settlers in Texas and the government were all causes of discord and heartburnings between the two governments that should be removed if possible. The Comanche Indians in Texas were very troublesome to the settle-

ments and occasioned great expense to the Mexican government to maintain garrisons there. Other tribes were moving into the region and increasing the trouble.

The territory of which the cession was desired by the United States was described as all lying east of a line drawn through the center of the desert or Grand Prairie between the Nueces and the Rio Grande "north to the mountains dividing the waters of the Rio Grande del Norte from those that run eastward to the Gulf, and until it strikes our present boundary at the forty-second degree of north latitude." If he found that the Mexican government objected to this line because it contained the large Mexican settlements of San Antonio de Bexar and La Bahia, but still found that government disposed to part with any portion of the territory in question then he was authorized to accept any of three other lines, regarding those farthest west as most desirable. The second should begin at the mouth of the La Vaca, ascend the left bank of that stream to its head, then due north to the Colorado, up the west bank of that river to its head, and "thence by the most direct course that will intersect our line at the forty-second degree of north latitude and include the head waters of the Arkansas and Red Rivers." The third line was to commence at the mouth of the Colorado and follow its west bank all the way and thence as described in the second. The fourth was to follow the west bank of the Brazos from its mouth to its source and thence to the forty-second degree as the two previous. Poinsett was authorized to make such alterations in these lines as should appear to him clearly beneficial.

The line proposed as the one most desirable to us would constitute a natural separation of the resources of the two nations. It is the center of a country uninhabitable on the Gulf; and on the mountains so difficult of access and so poor as to furnish no inducement for a land intercourse; and of course no theater for those differences that are almost inseparable from a neighborhood of commercial interests. It corresponds with the habitual feelings of the people of Mexico and with the avowed policy of the Mexican government by causing a wide separation and difficulties of intercourse between the inhabitants of the two countries, and by preventing those excitements and bickerings invariably produced by the contiguous operation of conflicting laws, habits, and interests.

The price to be offered for Texas Van Buren introduces by saying,

The President does not desire the proposed cession without rendering a just and fair equivalent for it. He therefore authorizes you to offer to the Mexican government for a cession according to the first-mentioned boundary a sum not exceeding four millions of dollars; and so strong are his convictions of its great value to the United States that he will not object if you should find it indispensably necessary to go as high as five millions.

For each of the other lines Poinsett was authorized to decide upon and offer what he considered a proportionate amount of the purchase price. It would be preferable to make the payments in three or four equal annual installments; but if necessary the whole sum could be paid within four months after the exchange of ratifications and delivery of the possession of the ceded territory. In case of success other details were provided for, such as rights of navigation and jurisdiction, validity of land grants, and the extension of personal and political rights to the inhabitants of the ceded territory.⁹²

Anthony Butler, the author of the report mentioned above as one of the principal bases of the instructions to purchase Texas, was selected by the administration to bear the letter to Poinsett. When in the middle of October of this year 1829 Poinsett was recalled at the request of the Mexican government, Butler, already on the ground, was appointed to represent the United States at Mexico, with the rank of chargé. On October 17 Jackson signed the letter investing Butler with full power to conduct the negotiation for Texas. The instructions of August 25, which he had borne to Poinsett, were to be his guide.⁹³

⁹²Van Buren to Poinsett, Aug. 25, 1829, MS. Dept. of St., Secret Record, I, 39; *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 1s., No. 42, p. 10; *B. and F. St. P.*, XXVI, 850. This was not entered in the regular volume of Instructions in the Department of State; nor in the regular volume of the Archives of the U. S. Embassy in Mexico. Jackson's full power to Poinsett to negotiate concerning the matter bears the same date as the instructions. See Van Buren MSS. Library of Congress, X.

⁹³Butler's commission as bearer of the despatch is Van Buren to Butler, Aug. 24, 1829, MS. Dept. of St., Secret Record, I, 52; his full power is Jackson to Butler, Oct. 17, 1829, *Ibid.*, 53; his instructions are Van Buren to Butler, Oct. 16, and P. S. Oct. 17, 1829, *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 2s., No. 351, pp. 40-53.

"Butler, an old comrade in arms of Jackson . . . lacked moral character and fitness for any position of trust. No worse selection for

Poinsett, convinced of the uselessness of attempting to acquire Texas, and feeling that his influence with the government was gone, appears to have refrained from even suggesting the new project. But the fact that the United States was ready to make a proposition for the purchase of Texas became public shortly after Poinsett's departure. On January 9, 1830, a paragraph appeared in the newspaper called *El Sol* declaring that,

A few days before the departure of Mr. Poinsett from this capital, the American Colonel Butler arrived here, commissioned, as it is said, by the government of Washington, to negotiate with ours for the cession of the province of Texas for the sum of five millions of dollars. As we are not informed that, so far, the colonel has made any overtures on the subject, we presume that he does the new administration the justice to suppose it incapable of lending itself to a transaction as prejudicial and degrading to the republic as it would be disgraceful to the minister who would subscribe to it.

Butler was mystified at being so quickly found out. He wrote Van Buren the next day that the paragraph was "a very remarkable one. You perceive that they undertake not only to assert that the object of my mission is the purchase of Texas, but they also state a price to be paid for the cession! I have not time to say much on this matter at present, but I will endeavor to unravel the mystery hereafter."⁹⁴ In the weeks preceding and following this a multitude of violently anti-American newspaper articles and pamphlets issued from the Mexican press, voicing the suspicion generally felt that the United States was attempting to dismember the Mexican republic. As evidence of the desire of the govern-

a diplomatic position could have been made. . . . [He] was charged with being a speculator in Texas lands, a gambler, a drunkard, and a liar. But this last epithet came from Jackson himself some years afterwards, when his shortness of memory afforded him an easy escape from the entanglements of fact. It is safe to say that Butler's mission, discreditable and even disgraceful, had much to do with the unsatisfactory course of our diplomatic relations with Mexico which ended in war. When Butler appears for the first time upon the stage of diplomacy, he had recently been in Texas and professed to be familiar with the proposed river boundaries. Sent to Mexico as bearer of despatches to Poinsett, he went overland, again through Texas, and secretly. . . . From 1829 to 1836, during practically all of Jackson's term, Anthony Butler represented, or rather misrepresented, the United States in Mexico." Reeves, *Diplomacy under Tyler and Polk*, 68.

⁹⁴Butler to Van Buren, Jan. 10, 1830, and enclosure, *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 2s., No. 351, p. 310.

ment and people of the United States for Mexican territory they unfortunately were able to cite the numerous articles which had been appearing in the administration newspapers in the United States dwelling on the value of Texas, and the desirability of its acquisition.⁹⁵

Finally the administration at Washington came to the conclusion that it was unwise, for the time being at least, to endeavor to make the purchase; and Van Buren wrote Butler April 1, 1830:

The unsettled state of affairs in Mexico, and the excitement growing out of it, to which reference has already been several times made in the course of this communication, have induced an apprehension on the part of the President that the present is not an auspicious moment for the successful opening of the negotiations which form the object of the instructions from this department of the 25th August, 1829. To watch the state of the public mind, the opinions of the principal members of the government, and hear what is said on all sides, is all that is, for the present, expected from your agency in the matter. In doing this the greatest caution and circumspection is enjoined upon you; and the exercise of the most guarded discretion will be necessary on your part not to commit yourself or your government upon any point connected with the subject. You will, also, in informing this department of the result of your observations and reflections, adopt every measure which prudence will suggest to insure the safety of your communications. If, however, an opportunity should present itself to carry into effect the wishes of your government, in this respect, you will not fail to embrace it upon the principles and according to the instructions already given to you.⁹⁶

As stated in the opening lines it is the purpose of this article to trace the relations between Mexico and the United States respecting Texas and the boundary only through the year 1829. The instruction of April 1 of the following year is introduced to show that the Jackson administration virtually withdrew the offer of the preceding August. In the hands of most diplomatic agents this instruction, taken together with the state of public opinion in Mexico, would have ended completely all effort to obtain the cession of Texas. But it was not so with Butler. He interpreted the last sentence quoted as leaving the matter entirely to his discretion. On receiving the letter he replied:

⁹⁵See McMaster, *U. S.*, V, 543-547.

⁹⁶Van Buren to Butler, April 1, 1830, *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 2s., No. 351, p. 62.

I am glad that you adopt the opinion that the present time is inauspicious for the commencement of the negotiation for Texas, and have placed under my discretion the period and the manner of opening that subject. That discretion shall be exercised with all proper caution, and my judgment taxed to the extent of its powers for securing success.⁹⁷

During the six years of his residence he never abandoned the project, showing in his correspondence with the officials of the government in Washington an unblushing readiness to resort to bribery and trickery when he found that legitimate diplomatic effort would not accomplish his purpose.⁹⁸ To show the ultimate failure of all negotiations respecting the boundary up to this date, the subsequent fate of the treaty of limits pending at this time should be briefly traced. It will be recalled that it was concluded January 12, 1828, and that owing to delay on the part of Mexico the exchange of ratifications was not effected within the stipulated time limit of four months. On April 5, 1831, an additional article was concluded renewing the treaty and extending the time for exchanging the ratifications one year from that date.⁹⁹ On April 5, 1832, the last day allowed, the ratifications were exchanged. This time the Mexican government acted nearly three months before the expiration of the time; but the United States delayed until the last day, the Mexican representative having declared two days earlier that his government had instructed him not to exchange the ratifications of the commercial treaty unless those of the treaty of limits could be exchanged at the same time, and the United States Senate having advised and consented to its ratification on the day preceding the exchange.¹⁰⁰ The one year provided in article three within which commissioners should meet to begin marking the line expired without Mexico's acting, though the United States had been prompt enough this time,¹⁰¹ and on April 3, 1835, a second additional article was agreed to, which

⁹⁷Butler to Van Buren, May 21, 1830, *Ibid.*, 326.

⁹⁸See Barker, "Jackson and the Tex. Rev.," *A. H. R.*, XII, 791-797.

⁹⁹U. S., *Treaties and Conventions*, 1776-1909, I, 1084.

¹⁰⁰*Ibid.*; and Montoya to Livingston, March 26, 1832, *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 1s., No. 42, p. 51; Same to same, March 31, 1832, *Ibid.*, 53; Same to same, April 3, 1832, *Ibid.*, 57.

¹⁰¹Castillo to McLane, Dec. 2, 1833, *H. Ex. Docs.*, 25c., 1s., No. 42, p. 60; Same to same, *Ibid.*, 62; McLane to Butler, Jan. 13, 1834, *Ibid.*, 16. Butler to Lombardo, Dec. 21, 1834, *Ibid.*, 38.

provided that the commissioners should be appointed within one year from the exchange of the ratifications of this second additional article. But the ratifications of this article were not exchanged till April 20, 1836,¹⁰² when Texas had wrested her independence from Mexico by force of arms. The commissioners never met.

With the attempts of the Mexican government in September, 1829, and April, 1830, to stop immigration into Texas from the United States the relations between Texas and Mexico and the relations between Mexico and the United States respecting Texas enter a new phase. This has been and is being treated sufficiently fully by students of the Texas Revolution, the Texas national period, and the annexation of Texas to the United States.

¹⁰²Mexico, *Trat. y Conv.*, I, 180.

PENNSYLVANIA AND THE INDEPENDENCE OF TEXAS

JAMES E. WINSTON

On September 28, 1785, in Christ Church, Philadelphia, Moses Austin of Durham, Connecticut, was married to Miss Maria Brown of Morris county, New Jersey, a descendant of Robert Turner, one of the distinguished founders of Pennsylvania. Moses Austin became a prosperous merchant, being at one time a member of the importing firm of Stephen Austin and Company of Philadelphia. Later a branch concern was established at Richmond, Virginia. From Richmond the father emigrated to Wythe county, in southwestern Virginia. Here on November 3, 1793, was born Stephen F. Austin, the greatest of Texas empresarios. The son of the Connecticut Yankee and of the descendant of Pennsylvania Quakers was, in later years, to lead a colony of Anglo-Americans into one of the provinces of Mexico which, in the course of time, was to throw off the control of the Spaniard and, as an independent republic, seek admission into the family of states of the American Union. But the Austin family did not long remain in their new home. The father was a man of keen business instincts and of bold enterprise. Bitten with the spirit of the pioneer, his eyes turned to the West and his thoughts traveled across the great Appalachian mountain system to the plains beyond the Father of Waters, where rumor said great lead mines lay buried, ready to yield their treasures to him who would risk the dangers of a western wilderness in their exploitation. So turning his back upon his Virginia home, the father, accompanied by wife and son, made the perilous and tiresome trip to what is now Missouri. Moses Austin's Journal remains, a vivid narrative of this journey.¹ This was in 1798 when the young Stephen was but five years of age. Here in what is now Washington county, the father began to develop "Mine-a-Burton." Business reverses came and Moses Austin soon found himself a ruined man financially. A man of less courage and perseverance would have given up the struggle, and either settled down

¹"Memorandum of M. Austin's Journey, 1796-1797," *Amer Hist. Rev.*, V, 518-542.

as a colonist in what was then a portion of "Upper Louisiana," or else in all probability have returned to the scene of his former enterprises. "Mine-a-Burton" would have been remembered only for the same reason as are remembered the stories of those hidden treasures which in more fantastic guise, had centuries before lured the Spaniard across the trackless wastes of arid plains, only to melt away at his approach. But disappointment and disaster only served to bring out in fuller measure the zeal and fortitude of the man. Nothing daunted by the difficulties which beset him, and sustained ever by the devotion of his faithful wife, Austin now conceived the idea of planting a colony in Texas. Far to the southwest lay the land of the Tejas,—a land of historic memories.

The region watered by the Brazos, the Colorado, and the Guadalupe, had been traversed by some of the greatest explorers that ever set foot upon the western continent. Across the plains that stretched between the Sabine and the Rio Grande del Norte wandered Cabeza de Vaca and his companions on one of the most marvelous expeditions that history has ever recorded. In his quest of the Seven Cities of Cibola, Coronado penetrated the northern portion of the province, braving the dangers of famine, of wild beasts, and of hostile Indians on his fruitless errand. The group of ruins of the missions established in and near San Antonio and at San Saba are a silent though none the less impressive tribute to the courage and devotion of the missionaries of the cross. Among the wild Indian tribes of the east and the west labored the gray friars, teaching, preaching, and catechising, striving to win from the powers of darkness the rude denizens of the wilderness. The hearts of these devoted monks must often have sunk within them as they realized the scant success which attended their efforts to instil the holy mysteries of the Catholic faith into the minds of the fierce Apaches and Comanches. Yet they would have been recreant to their trust and unworthy of the best traditions of their order had their spirits quailed at the dark prospects which confronted them. Had not disciples of the true faith planted the cross among the savage tribes which roamed over the frozen regions of the north? Members of their own great order had celebrated mass and chanted the Te Deum on the shores of Lake Huron in the presence of the astonished savages and of the greatest of

French explorers. The dearest ambition of his heart had been to erect a spiritual kingdom within the bounds of New France and to rescue from perdition a people living, as he tells us, "like brute beasts, without faith, without law, without religion, without God."² To snatch from perdition the souls of those benighted creatures who inhabited the southwestern fringe of the North American continent would only be adding one more achievement to the splendid role of victories which had marked the progress of their order's growth. Already Franciscan convents by the hundred had been planted in Spanish America. Providence had bestowed its choicest gifts upon the region which invited them to come and undertake the conversion of its heathen dwellers. In the same spirit in which the Recollets had labored among the Hurons and the Montagnais of New France, would the Querétarans and Zacatecans strive to reclaim from paganism and savagery the roving tribes that dwelt to the east of the Rio Grande. The country which made up the *provincias internas* of Spain's possessions beyond the Rio Grande stood out in striking contrast to the land of ice and snow, of lakes and forests, amid which toiled the missionaries who had followed the routes of Champlain. This land of mesquite and cactus had been traversed by Hernando de Soto, who in all probability, penetrated the region south of the Red River. Not far from the coast on the banks of the Lavaca, La Salle had built Fort St. Louis, while in the neighborhood of the Trinity, the great explorer met his tragic end. These intrepid explorers were the embodiment of the romantic spirit of adventure. But the Spanish priests were as eager for the conversion of the natives as were the explorers for the discovery of gold or the South Sea. The land had witnessed the intrigues of Louis Juchereau de Saint-Denis. It had been the objective of the filibustering expeditions of Nolan, Magee, and Long, and had no doubt figured in the dark schemes of Wilkinson and the conspiracy of Aaron Burr.

This was the region in which Moses Austin determined to plant a colony of Anglo-Americans. The time seemed ripe for such an enterprise. But the hardships incurred in the inception of the undertaking cost him his life. Upon his son Stephen fell the responsibility of carrying out the wishes of the father. How well

²Parkman, *Pioneers of France in the New World*, 384.

the son accomplished the task is a matter of history. The first steps were taken in 1821. Years passed by. In 1835 the settlers of the province found themselves driven to take up arms against the despotic measures of Santa Anna. The news of the rebellion then going on in Texas traveled far and wide, and from every section of the United States volunteers rushed to Texas, eager to have a hand in the defense of the province.³

It is hardly a matter of surprise that the citizens of the great state whose beginnings were undertaken so largely on account of a belief in the principles of religious liberty should have had their hearts stirred at the news of the dangers threatening their fellow-countrymen at the hands of those aliens in race and religion.

Pennsylvania Volunteers in Texas

In April, 1836, letters appeared in the leading papers of Philadelphia calling upon the citizens of that city to send the Texans such aid as they might be inclined and to bear the expenses of a company of fifty men which, it was said, was then forming for the purpose of going to Texas.⁴ The call did not fall upon deaf ears. Public meetings were held, resolutions offering sympathy

³A company of Germans is said to have been embodied at Pittsburgh in November for the purpose of proceeding to Texas. *New York Evening Post*, November 25, 1835; *Albany Argus*, November 23, 1835. In this same month John J. Schuler, W. Carothers, Alfred Creigh, W. B. Parkinson, and John H. Noble, a committee, write to tell Austin that from fifty to seventy young men of Carlisle, Pa., are anxious to help Texas, provided they are needed, and can make their way to that country. MS. Austin Papers.

Of similar interest in this same connection is a letter from one S. H. Steedman to Smith. It was written from 'Chillisquaque near Milton,' Northumberland county, and is dated Dec. 30, 1835. In this he writes "as an individual selected from among my comrades" to find out whether Texas has an agency at New York or Philadelphia to defray the expenses "of those who desire to render you relief. If you furnish the means—— to bear the expenses and equipage, there can be a company of young men from thirty to fifty and probably amounting to one hundred raised— of the old Susquehanna River—whose fathers fought and bled in the country's cause." MS. Texas State Library.

⁴*Philadelphia National Gazette*, April 12, 1836. An enquiry was addressed on the same date to the editor of the *United States Gazette* for the purpose of learning whether Colonel Austin would favor a number of young men with an interview. Colonel Austin was in New York but seems to have returned to Philadelphia the next day. Austin was in the latter city on the 9th. I am indebted to the Pennsylvania Historical Society for permission to examine the file of this journal.

and aid were drawn up, money was subscribed, and volunteers were enrolled. All this is little short of remarkable when one recalls how great the distances were which, at this time, separated the people of Pennsylvania from the settlers in Texas. The only hypothesis upon which their interest can be explained is that in the eyes of the citizens of the northern state, the colonists who had emigrated beyond the Sabine were justified in taking up arms to redress the wrongs with which they saw themselves threatened.

Among those who took part in the ill-fated Tampico expedition and who were shot at Tampico on Monday, December 14, 1835, were three Pennsylvanians: Arthur H. Clement, aged forty; Thomas Whitaker, aged thirty; Charles Gross, aged twenty-three. A young man of twenty-five from Pittsburgh by the name of Fleming died in the hospital.⁵ The Philadelphia papers of April 11, 1836, contained the news of the fall of the Alamo. Several Pennsylvanians perished at that time. The roll of honor is as follows: Capt. F. J. Desauque of Philadelphia, who had been the bearer of an express from General Houston and who, with Capt. Benj. H. Holland and an ensign, bore a flag of truce to General Urrea; John Thurston, who is said to have been a clerk in Desauque's store; William Cummings; William Johnson, of Philadelphia; Williamson, a serjeant major from the same city; and Browne, Holloway, Smith and Voluntine.⁶

One of the most noted companies that saw service in the Texan cause was the New Orleans Greys, which embarked from that city in October of 1835 on the schooner Columbus. The members reported for duty November 22, having landed at Velasco and Quintana, and marched some two hundred and fifty miles to San Antonio. Many of those comprising this company were murdered with Colonel Fannin four months later. Among the Pennsylvanians who, as members of the above company, comprised a part of Colonel Fannin's command occur the names of George W. Gilland,

⁵*United States Gazette*, January 11, 1836. For an account of the Tampico expedition, see Barker, "The Tampico Expedition," in *THE QUARTERLY*, VI, 169-186.

⁶*Muster Rolls*, General Land Office of Texas, 238. *United States Gazette*, April 28, 1836; *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser*, May 4, 1836; Newell, *History of the Revolution in Texas*, App., 211.

Joseph P. Riddle, and James West.⁷ On that fatal Palm Sunday, March 19, 1836, when so many of the volunteers from the United States fell victims to Mexican treachery, more than one native of Pennsylvania were among the slain.

Among these were Gilland, Riddle, and West, already mentioned. George Dedrick was a private in the cavalry corps of which Mirabeau B. Lamar was commander. He had emigrated from Philadelphia in 1835, taking part in the Tampico expedition. His object in going to Texas, he writes his wife, was "to Volenteer in ade of the Caus of Liberty" and again, "My object of Goin on this Exposishen was for you my Self and Son and all my famaley hereafter." After giving an account of what he expected to receive in the way of land, he concludes,

My Love one word to you and my Son. You must do the best you posable Can. wen I Receve my half yearley pay from the Government I will Send You Som Money. Should eney thing befall me you can Sell your Clame to Reckoley but, I shall Live I trust to injoy the frutes of my Labor with my beloved famaley. bring up Charles in obedance to your Comands. I Shall be home in time to See him go to chool [school] and Lurn [learn] him to Repeate what his father has done for him. My Respects to all—To you and my Son Receve my Lasting affection. Right wen you receve this letter. Right to me Direct Goliad Texes in the care of Leftenant Thornton.⁸

Three weeks had barely passed when husband and father met a fate similar to that of many another brave man who had left home and loved ones and gone to Texas in the hope of bettering his worldly fortunes. Other Pennsylvanians who fell at the time of Fannin's massacre were Lieutenant Evan M. Thomas, of Philadelphia, a member of the Texas Rifle Brigade; Captain T. K. Pearson of the artillery, from the same city; and Stephen D. Hurst, likewise from Philadelphia, who was aid to Colonel Fannin, and held a colonel's command. He was formerly a clerk in the

⁷*Muster Rolls*, 238; *United States Gazette*, July 16, 1836, quoting the *New Orleans Bulletin*, June 29, 1836. According to Brown, *History of Texas*, I, 404, the following names should be included: William Boyle, Charles W. Conner, John Connell, Martin K. Snell, Mandred Wood. Of these Conner was killed by the Mexicans near San Antonio, leaving a mother and sister in Philadelphia. *Poulson's Advertiser*, January 8, 1836.

⁸The letter is printed in *THE QUARTERLY*, XI, 157-161.

postoffice of his native city and is described as a young man of amiable disposition, courteous deportment, and warm attachments, and withal a gallant soldier.⁹

On April 14, 1836, R. Jenks Markham of Philadelphia, and George Copeland, aged sixteen, of the same place, were shot at Matamoras. Of these the latter had served with Grant and Johnson in the campaign of 1836. Lewis H. Kerr, aged thirty-three, and P. S. Mahan, aged twenty-two, are said to have been confined at this same place.¹⁰ The following Pennsylvanians are said to have rendered service in behalf of the Texan cause: Lyman W. Alexander and William Langerheirmer, in connection with the storming of San Antonio; George H. Bringhurst, who was captured at C6pano; George Ewing, who took part in the Grass Fight; J. Barnhart, who served in Captain Burrow's company; P. H. McBride, who was a member of Captain Stephenson's company; John Duncan, William P. Kerr, John Leman, and Thomas Martin, all of whom took part in the campaign of 1836. Giles A. Gidding is said to have been mortally wounded at San Jacinto.¹¹

From the *Muster Rolls* we learn that these Pennsylvanians were enrolled for service in Texas: Robert Musselman, John Scott, Robert Crasson, Samuel Sprague, W. J. Lewis, John B. Westbrook, John T. Smith, and one McNally.¹² In Captain Laurence's company were enrolled at Louisville David Sample, Francis A. Whiakker (Whitaker?), George W. Hensal; at New Orleans, Jacob Elliott and Robert Hutchisson; at Portland, Solomon Barrows and Charles N. Cranes; all for the duration of the war. In Captain Allen's company for a similar p6rior there were enrolled at Louisville, John Moyer, Robert Neil, and J. D. Schooll; at Cincinnati, Foster Servers, William Peters, and Michael Myres; at New Orleans, W. D. Brown; at Portland, R. D. Ramsay. The Zanesville Volunteer Rifle Company contained three Pennsylvanians.¹³

⁹*Philadelphia National Gazette*, May 5, 6, 19, 1836; *United States Gazette*, May 11, 1836.

¹⁰*Philadelphia National Gazette*, May 17, 20, 1836. This P. S. Mahan is no doubt the P. Jenks Mahan who is said to have served with Grant and Johnson in the campaign of 1835.

¹¹Cf. Baker's *Texas Scrap Book*, 585; Thrall, *A Pictorial History of Texas*, 541. Gidding was a member of Company A, Third Regiment, Texas Volunteers.

¹²*Muster Rolls*, 238.

¹³*Ibid.*, 230, 238, 239.

On Monday afternoon, May 30, a meeting of Texan sympathizers was held at Military Hall, on Library Street. At the meeting it was resolved to form a company to emigrate to Texas under Colonel Britton Evans and join the army of Houston.¹⁴ In the *United States Gazette* for June 3 appeared a notice signed by J. D. Wood and Adolphus A. Rutter for the Texas Emigration Company of Philadelphia inviting prospective emigrants to assemble at the Jefferson House Dock between Front and Second Streets. On Saturday the 16th of July, a vessel left New Castle with between fifty and sixty volunteers bound for Texas.¹⁵ Some of these were no doubt Pennsylvanians. A dispatch from Bermuda, dated August 2, 1836, stated that the American schooner, General De Kalb, one Matthews, master, had put into port for food and water. The vessel had been out ten days from Philadelphia and was bound for New Orleans. She carried between forty and fifty volunteers comprising privates and officers under the command of Captain Ramsay for the Texan army. These were described as being somewhat "pugnacious in disposition."¹⁶ A company of volunteers from Washington, Pennsylvania, is said to have arrived at New Orleans under Colonel A. Thruston about the middle of November.¹⁷ It was not only upon the field of battle that Pennsylvanians rendered the republic of Texas service. S. Rhoads Fisher, first secretary of the Texan navy, was a Pennsylvanian and one of the first two members of Congress from Texas.¹⁸

Public Meetings of Texan Sympathizers

The numerous meetings which were held in Philadelphia by Texan sympathizers during the spring and summer of 1836 are an indication of the deep interest felt by the citizens of that city in the stirring events that were happening in the region beyond the Sabine. Two days before the battle of San Jacinto a meeting in favor of Texas was advertised in the city papers. This meeting was held at the Tontine and was attended by such a crowd that

¹⁴*United States Gazette*, May 30, 31, 1836. L. S. Haighler was chosen chairman of the meeting, and L. S. Briest, secretary.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, July 21, 1836.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, August 23, 1836.

¹⁷*New York Courier and Enquirer*, December 1, 1836.

¹⁸THE QUARTERLY, V, 33.

many could not gain admittance. A committee of arrangements was announced, the committee being composed of thirty-nine citizens.¹⁹ On Monday afternoon, May 2, a large and enthusiastic meeting of Texan sympathizers was held at the District Court House. Major Peter Fritz presided, the meeting being addressed by the three Texan commissioners to the United States, Austin, Archer, and Wharton. Addresses were also made by D. P. Brown, Robert Conrad, C. Naylor, and Willis Hall, a member of the Texas committee in New York City. Resolutions were drawn up and adopted. These resolutions declared that the usurpations of Santa Anna were full justification for resistance; abhorrence was expressed for the manner in which the Mexicans had conducted the war; admiration was evinced for the patriots of Texas; it was the duty of every lover of liberty to contribute as much as he could to sustain Texas; Congress should be memorialized as to the affairs of Texas; the meeting called upon the President to intervene, if possible, and finally a committee was appointed to solicit funds.²⁰ The papers which published accounts of this meeting contained the following notice: "Texas Committee—The Committee will meet at the Bolivar House this evening at 7½ o'clock, on special business. Punctual attendance is respectfully requested." Daily meetings of this committee continued to be held at the Independence Hotel on Chestnut Street, opposite the State House. Stuart Newell, the secretary, further manifested his concern in the Texan cause by advertising for sale eight hundred acres of land in Luzerne county, one-half of the proceeds of the sale of the said

¹⁹The names of those composing the committee were Gen. Robert Patterson, Col. John Swift, L. A. Godey, Major Peter Fritz, Marshall Sproggell, Geo. W. Jones, Col. W. P. Smith, Jos. Aiken, Wm. English, B. Duke, Stuart Newell, E. D. Tarr, Daniel Felter, Andrew Nanderson, Jno. K. Walker, Wm. Davis, S. P. Rudolph, Jno. Jordan, Jno. Manderson, Gen. Jno. D. Goodwin, Jno. Naglee, Chas. Naylor, Jno. Conrad, Jno. G. Wolf, Martin McMichael, Thos. D. Grover, Robt. Morris, Jno. F. Stump, Col. Jno. Thompson, Wm. F. Hughes, Col. Geo. Roshler, N. C. Foster, Wm. C. Johnson, W. G. Alexander, Wm. Wood, Augustus D. Tarr. Thos. S. Smith was chairman of the meeting, and Robert T. Conrad, secretary. *United States Gazette*, April 19, 1836.

²⁰*Ibid.*, May 3, 1836; *Philadelphia National Gazette*, May 3, 1836. The vice-presidents of the meeting were Cols. Jno. Thompson, W. P. Smith, S. H. Perkins, J. S. Riley, and private S. Newman. The secretaries were Geo. Norton, Robt. Morris, and C. D. Lybrand. It may be noted that memorials from citizens of Philadelphia were presented in the Senate May 9.

land to be appropriated to the aid of the Texans.²¹ He found it necessary to warn Philadelphians against paying money to unauthorized persons, who had collected some thirty or forty dollars from Texas sympathizers.²² This executive committee continued to meet frequently until the close of the summer. Its membership was increased in numbers to forty-five. At a meeting held on Thursday, May 19, Major Peter Fritz was elected treasurer. Persons were appointed by the committee as legal collectors in the city districts. It was resolved that the funds so raised should not go toward the expenses of any self-appointed command of volunteers that was being formed at the time.²³ The *United States Gazette* of June 9 contains reference to an "Original Texas Committee" which was scheduled to meet at David Paul Brown's office at the southwest corner of Chestnut and Seventeenth Streets on that evening.²⁴ Later in the month we find the Texas executive committee meeting on Tuesday and Friday evenings. The name of William White, Jr., occurs as secretary.²⁵ A meeting held on Thursday evening, August 18, appointed collectors to solicit contributions and recommended that the residents of towns and villages hold meetings for the purpose of arousing interest in the cause of Texas.²⁶

A public meeting of citizens of Philadelphia was scheduled for the evening of May 17 at the house of D. Newman, who lived on Eighth Street above Willow.²⁷ No account of this meeting was

²¹*Philadelphia National Gazette*, May 5, 7, 1836. This journal of May 4 and 6 contained Austin's Louisville address.

²²*United States Gazette*, May 19, 1836.

²³*Ibid.*, June 4, 1836. John Conrad was the chairman of this meeting. The new members were: Robt. C. Martin, Geo. W. South, Thos. Koehler, Wm. Stephens, Wm. Vogdes, Chas. Hinkle, Erastus M. Gathery, Thos. C. Clark, Jos. C. Neal, Thos. B. Florence, Napoleon B. Evans, Chas. K. Servoss, Capt. Theo. Gillies, D. P. Brown, Dr. Thos. C. Bunting, Jno. Leadbetter, Jr., Nathan Levering, Chas. D. Lybrand, Wm. White, Jr., Robt. C. Conrad, Thos. Boyd, Henry Derringer, A. J. Pleasanton, Henry Remmey, Wm. Linkey, Dr. Alex. Ramsey, Thos. B. Town, Jas. Sloan.

²⁴It is not clear just what relation existed between this committee and the executive committee.

²⁵*United States Gazette*, June 17, 1836.

²⁶*Ibid.*, August 25, 1836. Theodore Gillies was appointed chairman of this meeting. The following were added to the membership of the committee: Jno. H. Frick, Robt. Morris, Jos. C. Neal, Peter Hay, Jos. Wood, Jos. S. Serosse, Jas. Reed, Henry Derringer, L. A. Godey, Jno. Thompson, T. R. Moffatt.

²⁷*Ibid.*, May 7, 1836.

published. Shortly afterward a large meeting of Texan sympathizers was held at the same place. The meeting is said to have been eloquently addressed by Charles Naylor and others. Resolutions were adopted declaring the intention of those present to unite with their fellow citizens in aid of Texas; abhorrence was expressed for the practices of Santa Anna; the citizens of the city and county were earnestly recommended to adopt speedy measures relative to the oppressed Texans; the independence of Texas should be recognized at once by the United States; the claims of Mexico for neutrality had been forfeited by the outrages of Santa Anna.²⁸ For the purpose of securing emigrants for Texas a general meeting was held at Military Hall on the evening of May 30. The assemblage is said to have been feelingly addressed by Colonel Britton Evans. A committee of five was designated for the purpose of conferring with the general executive committee of the city. As usual, a series of resolutions were adopted. These expressed the determination of those present to embark under Colonel Evans and offer their services to Houston; to wear the badge of mourning on their left arm for the Texan martyrs of liberty; to appeal for help for the general Texas committee; and finally as friends of religious and civil liberty the members declared their readiness to sacrifice all for the Texan cause.²⁹ In the following July a call was issued for another public meeting to be held on the evening of the 18th for the purpose of devising means for helping the suffering women and children of Texas. The funds collected were not to be used for furthering the action of the Texan government nor to aid in establishing the political independence of the colonists. The meeting was well attended. The mayor acted as president, assisted by David Paul Brown and N. C. Foster as vice-presidents. The meeting was eloquently addressed by Samuel Brashears and Mr. Brown. A set of resolutions for carrying into effect the object

²⁸*Philadelphia National Gazette*, May 16, 1836. Thos. W. Dukes was chosen president of this meeting; Daniel Newman and David R. Graham, vice-presidents, and Jesse Williamson, secretary.

²⁹*United States Gazette*, May 31, 1836. L. S. Haighler was chairman of the meeting, and L. S. Briest, secretary. Dr. J. H. Carr, Briest, Haighler, Dr. Burks and B. Grant were appointed to confer with the general city committee. The committee on resolutions consisted of Carr, Briest, Lockwood, Steele, and Zantzing.

of the meeting was unanimously adopted.³⁰ A few days later a call was issued for another Texas meeting. The call was signed by John Swift, president, George M. Dallas, Joseph R. Chandler, David Paul Brown, and N. C. Foster, vice-presidents, and Francis H. Stout, Stewart Newell, secretaries. Suitable accommodations, it was said, would be provided for ladies. In consequence "a very numerous and highly respectable meeting" was held at Masonic Hall on Tuesday evening, July 26. A series of resolutions introduced by D. P. Brown expressed deep sympathy for those engaged in a glorious struggle for Texan liberty; the members exulted in the triumphs, and suffered in the sufferings of their brethren in Texas; an urgent call was made for money for the aid of the suffering women and children of that community. A committee of twenty-five was designated to secure contributions from citizens generally for this cause.³¹ Another meeting of the friends of Texas was held in the County Court room on the evening of August 8. Colonel Charles K. Servoss was chosen president, Captain Theodore Gillies, John Jordan, Miles N. Carpenter, vice-presidents, and Stewart Newell and James Henry Carr, secretaries. The preamble and resolutions adopted by the meeting dealt with the Texan struggle in no equivocal fashion. Sympathy was expressed for the Texans, who were declared to be struggling for that freedom for which the fathers of '76 had died. The members pledged themselves to use every possible means to assist the Texans to obtain religious and political liberty. This was declared to be no violation of the law of nations nor of the treaty with Mexico. "We highly approve of the votes given in Congress in favor of the recognition of the independence of Texas, and, in our opinion, [it] should be a cause of great satisfaction [to Congressmen] in their good old age, that they had shown their approbation of the cause of Texas." "That we highly approve of the

³⁰*United States Gazette*, July 16, 18, 1836; *Philadelphia National Gazette*, July 19, 1836. The call for the meeting was signed by Jno. Swift, Geo. M. Dallas, Jos. R. Chandler, Samuel Brashears, David P. Brown.

³¹*United States Gazette*, July 29, 1836. The members of the committee to collect funds were Jno. Hemphill, D. P. Brown, N. C. Foster, Samuel Brashears, Jno. C. Montgomery, Geo. M. Dallas, Jno. L. Hodges, Jas. Ronaldson, Jos. R. Chandler, Daniel Fidler, Col. Jno. Thompson, Peter Hay, Jas. Hanna, Benj. Duncan, Chas. Naylor, Thos. D. Grover, Gabriel Kerr, Samuel F. Reed, Jno. Swift, Francis H. Stout, Benj. Mifflin, Jno. R. Walker, Norris Stanley, Jno. M. Kennedy, Jno. Naglee.

recognition of Texas, and the President would gild his latter days' declining sun with additional lustre by using speedily the authority vested in him by the Congress of 1835-6." The exertions making in various parts of the country to raise men and money for Texas were endorsed. Finally, it was resolved to appoint a committee of two persons from each block and a suitable number in the county to solicit subscriptions to aid "our brethren in Texas."³²

A "numerous and highly respectable adjourned meeting" of the friends of Texas followed on Thursday evening, August 11. As was the case in former meetings a preamble and resolutions drawn up by Newell, one of the secretaries, were adopted. One of these resolutions declared the occupation of a part of Texas by the troops of General Gaines a wise and just policy, savoring much more of humanity than of war. The President and Secretary of War would receive the approbation of *all* friends of liberty and good order by ordering such a possession of Texas. A brief and eloquent address was made by Mr. Moffatt. He was followed by Dr. A. C. Draper, who, "in a bold and glowing manner depicted the sufferings of the Texans in a strain of sublime and touching pathos." Then Mr. William Maurese of New York craved the indulgence of the meeting; his first attempt at public speaking called forth repeated bursts of applause. An executive committee was empowered to appoint ward committees to solicit funds.³³ From the number and enthusiasm of the meetings held by citizens of Philadelphia, it is seen that interest in the Texan cause was much greater than that manifested in some other states, such as Virginia, for instance,—a fact which shows how completely non-sectional was the Texan question at this time. The people of New York and of Philadelphia were just as eager for the independence of Texas as were

³²*United States Gazette*, August 11, 1836. A general committee appointed by this meeting consisted of Gen. Jno. D. Goodwin, Col. Chas. K. Servoss, Capt. Theo. Gillies, D. P. Brown, Dr. Thos. C. Bunting, Jno. Jarden, Daniel Fitler, Wm. Davis, Daniel Green, Wm. Eppelsheimer, Jacob Jarden, Dr. Thos. Badaraque, Miles N. Carpenter, Wm. H. McCrea, Samuel Brick, Jno. Barclay, Stewart Nevell, Dr. M. M. Reeve, Col. Jas. Woodman, Thos. B. Town.

³³*United States Gazette*, August 13, 1836. Capt. Theodore Gillies presided at this meeting, Jarden and Carpenter were chosen vice-presidents, and Newell and Carr secretaries. The executive committee was made up of those appointed at the previous meeting with the addition of Jas. Henry Carr.

those of Louisville or of New Orleans. A memorial from sundry individuals of Philadelphia praying the interposition of the United States in the cause of Texas was read in the Senate May 9.³⁴ Mr. Buchanan, on May 16, presented thirteen memorials from citizens of Philadelphia, praying for the acknowledgment of the independence of Texas.³⁵ On May 30, James Harper, of Pennsylvania, moved to suspend the rules of the House in order that he might present a petition from the citizens of Philadelphia for the recognition of the independence of Texas.³⁶ It is a significant fact that from the legislature of Connecticut, and from the citizens of Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia came memorials urging Congress to recognize the independence of Texas; while citizens of Mississippi, Louisiana, and South Carolina protested against such a course. But formal meetings, resolutions of sympathy, and the soliciting of funds were not the only means resorted to by the friends of Texas for aiding that community.

On May 17, 1836, the following notice appeared in the *National Gazette*: "Managers of the Texian Ball will hold an adjourned Meeting at the Marshall House, on Wednesday evening, 18th inst. at 8 o'clock. Punctual attendance is particularly requested." At the instance of the Texas Committee, which has been alluded to above, Mr. Francis C. Wemyss tendered the use of his theatre on Walnut Street for a Texas benefit on the evening of May 25. On this occasion *Othello* was presented by local talent. Mr. William Watson followed with a comic song entitled the "Comforts of Man." The performance was concluded with a farce entitled "Perfection, or the Maid of Munster."³⁷ An evening or two later at the Arch Street theatre "The Fall of the Alamo, or Texas and Her Oppressors," was produced with considerable effect.³⁸ On June 8 *Othello* was again presented by an attractive cast at the Arch Street theatre for the benefit of Texas. Mr. Burton sung for the first time a new comic song entitled "All for Texas, or Volunteers for Glory." The

³⁴*Senate Docs.*, 1st Session, 24th Congress, V, No. 365.

³⁵*Cong. Globe*, 1st Session, 24th Congress, III, 380.

³⁶*Ibid.*, III, 410. J. M. Wolfe had visited Pennsylvania among other states, in the spring of 1836, for the purpose of getting memorials sent to Congress.

³⁷*United States Gazette*, May 25, 1836.

³⁸*Philadelphia National Gazette*, May 27, 1836.

entertainment was concluded with a farce, "The Chimney Piece, or Natural Magic."³⁹

Attitude of Philadelphia Newspapers Toward the Revolution

Of the two leading newspapers of Philadelphia which have been cited above, the *United States Gazette* was consistently friendly to Texas. This journal referred early in the year to the untiring efforts of Colonel Austin for the past fifteen years to populate Texas; to his exertions in the present crisis to resist oppression, and to his ambition to promote the cause of constitutional freedom and the prosperity of his adopted country.⁴⁰ An editorial in the issue of April 9 expressed the opinion, which was by no means generally held at that date, that Mexico could not hope for much success against Texas. The United States should offer to mediate between Texas and Mexico. The former country might even lend Texas the money that was needed to satisfy Mexico in return for acknowledging the independence of Texas. This last suggestion was purely chimerical of course. Numerous articles upon the Texas question were contributed to the press of the United States during the revolution in Texas. Some of these took the form of elaborate essays in which the entire history of the Texan struggle was reviewed. The question of slavery and the bearing of the possible independence of Texas upon the further extension of slavery came in for a considerable amount of treatment. One writer contended that the question of Texas being slave or free should be determined by a majority of her citizens after freedom had been obtained.⁴¹ A series of articles was contributed to the *Gazette* by a writer signing himself "Washington." The second article of the series pronounced the slave population of the United States vastly better situated than the black population of Africa. The proper solution of the slavery question was to indemnify their masters, educate the negro and return him to Africa. The chief injury resulting from slavery was the harm it did the white popu-

³⁹*United States Gazette*, June 8, 1836.

⁴⁰*Ibid.*, January 25, 1836.

⁴¹*Ibid.*, April 20, 1836. In the issue of this paper for May 13, 1836, appeared an article on the "Cause of the War"—a vindication of the Texans.

lation, a statement which few would be prone to deny. The independence of Texas would result in a fine country being opened up to emigrants and an added *desideratum* would be the paving of the way for the abolition of slavery in the border slave states of Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri.⁴²

Far different was the attitude of the *Philadelphia National Gazette* to the events then happening in Texas. While the editor avowed his intention to manifest perfect impartiality and not to withhold his sympathy from any who were battling for their rights, yet it was only at intervals that the story of the exciting events happening beyond the Sabine stirred the enthusiasm of the editor of the *Gazette* and caused him to forget his pose of lofty impartiality. It was some consolation to the friends of Texas to know that this journal subscribed to the sentiments of the *National Intelligencer* to the effect that it was a very laudable thing to apply the money raised by popular subscription to the sufferers in Texas,—that is, to the widows and orphans of those who had fallen while resisting the Mexicans. The *Intelligencer* even proposed that Congress should appropriate funds for the personal relief of the sufferers.⁴³ Column after column in the *Gazette* was taken up with a series of essays entitled "Texas Insurrection," signed by one styling himself "Columbus."⁴⁴ To the writer the struggle going on in Texas was nothing but a grand scheme of iniquity concocted for the purpose of re-establishing slavery in the Texas country. In a succeeding article the writer essayed to "Trace the subject of the *Texian revolt* through the whole concatenation of its primary causes and objects," and to set forth the "motives of personal aggrandizement, avaricious adventure, and unlimited, enduring oppression" actuating the vast combination of interests that was behind the Texas revolt.⁴⁵ But such articles

⁴²*United States Gazette*, May 2, 1836. Cf also *Ibid.*, May 26, June 7, 16, 1836.

⁴³*Philadelphia National Gazette*, April 13, May 3, 1836.

⁴⁴These articles were republished in a pamphlet entitled, *The Origin and True Causes of the Texas Insurrection, Commenced in the Year 1835*. Cf. Bancroft, *North Mexican States and Texas*, II, 159, note.

⁴⁵*Philadelphia National Gazette*, May 17, 21, 1836. The main object of the writer was to prove that the revolt was not so much the deed of the actual settlers as of the land speculators and slaveholders in the United States.

did not reflect the sentiment of a majority of the citizens of Philadelphia, and in consequence the editor of the *Gazette* found himself denounced as a "bloody papist" on account of the attitude of his paper and his conduct severely criticised for publishing such articles in reply in which the *Gazette* defended its position on the Texas question. Though disavowing any friendly feeling for the Abolitionists, the editor was convinced the chief cause for commencing the struggle was in order to carry on the slave trade; no justification existed for rebellion on the part of the Texans; their cause was destitute of all claim upon the friends of genuine liberty and right.⁴⁶ From afar the editor of the *Boston Atlas* scented the true cause of the rebellion in Texas,—it had been set on by Austin who wanted to introduce slavery. The *New York American* of April 29 was bitter in its condemnation of American raisers of slave stock.⁴⁷ A writer signing himself "M" addressed several open letters to Colonel Austin in *Poulson's Advertiser*. One of these contained the query: "Is, or is it not the intention of the leaders of the Texians to make Texas a slave country?" The apprehension of this, it was asserted, was causing a deep feeling against Colonel Austin and his friends to pervade the minds of the community.⁴⁸ To the editor of the *Gazette* Burnet's proclamation *prohibiting slavery* was proof positive that the Texans were fighting "Freedom's battle" for the purpose of riveting slavery's chain.⁴⁹ It is more surprising to find a voice from Mississippi protesting in a similar vein against the independence of Texas. In speculating upon the effect on the South of the independence of Texas this writer is of the opinion that the only thing that can render the independence of Texas desirable or its annexation to the United States worth while is the hope that she would become the slave market of the whole South. The acknowledgment of Texas independence will prove a dark day for the South,—our territory being already of sufficient extent and our frontier enlarged enough.⁵⁰ This reminds one of a similar fear expressed by Webster: "We want no extension of territory. We want no accession

⁴⁶*Ibid.*, April 30, May 12, 1836.

⁴⁷Quoted in *Philadelphia National Gazette*, April 29, 1836.

⁴⁸*Poulson's Advertiser*, April 12, 15, 20, 1836.

⁴⁹*Philadelphia National Gazette*, May 13, 1836.

⁵⁰*Ibid.*, June 25, 1836.

of new states. The country is already large enough."⁵¹ "Shall the free states yield to southern threats and annex Texas?" asks *Poulson's Advertiser*. According to this journal the Union if further extended to Mexico would fall in ruins.⁵²

Having thus demonstrated the Texas question to be a "monstrous scheme of iniquity," and shown how doubtful even to the South was the economic gain of acquiring the region between the Sabine and the Rio Grande, those who took an impartial view of the situation proceeded further to point out the danger of a clash between United States troops and those of Mexico, and the hazards of hostilities with that country.⁵³ Not only was a war waged for absolute independence impolitic and quite premature, but what was more to the point, the contest was a hopeless one for the "Texians," their only salvation being in the interference of our government.⁵⁴ As confirmatory of this view, the *Philadelphia Gazette* printed the week following the battle of San Jacinto a letter from a faint-hearted member of the Washington Convention stating that everything was lost unless speedy assistance was received from the United States.

Another reason why there was not a greater general sympathy in favor of the colonists, according to this journal, was that enthusiasm was subdued by statements respecting the dubious character of the leaders, such as Houston, for instance. The character of the emigrants was in keeping with that of such unscrupulous men as Austin, Archer, Wharton, Burnett, and the rest; for "all the murderers, swindlers, horse-thieves who have fled the Southern states for the last ten years" have gone to Texas. Those who did not find it safe to live at home had found an asylum in Texas.⁵⁵ Moreover it was a notorious fact that the standard of independence in that country had been raised for the benefit of land speculators;

⁵¹Rhodes, *History of the United States*, I, 91.

⁵²*Poulson's Advertiser*, June 29, 1836.

⁵³*Philadelphia National Gazette*, May 6, 1836.

⁵⁴*Philadelphia National Gazette*, April 28, 1836, quoting the *New Orleans True American* of April 13. According to the *Nashville Banner* of April 27 there was small hope of checking the enemy. On the other hand the *Evening Star* of Philadelphia asserted that "Texas sooner or later from its position must become the property of the United States." Quoted by the *Commonwealth*, Frankfort, Ky., Nov. 14, 1835.

⁵⁵*Philadelphia National Gazette*, April 20, 27, 29, 1836.

these were the ones who were eager for the immediate recognition of Texas and who sent back home the stories about the Mexicans running away from Texas.⁵⁶

The story of the massacre of Fannin and his men was received with incredulity by the papers unfriendly to Texas nearly two months after that event. The *Philadelphia Gazette* expressed pity for the "unsophisticated philanthropy and tender-hearted compassion" of those who mourned the fate of the victims of Mexican atrocity; it endorsed the opinion of the *National Intelligencer* that "the citizens of the United States who have entered the Mexican territory in hostile array, with arms in their hands, have done so at their own peril, and have only themselves to blame for the consequences."⁵⁷ On the other hand when rumors of the victory at San Jacinto began to be circulated in the east, the editor of the *Gazette* admitted his desire to see the minions of Santa Anna thoroughly scourged for their cruel barbarities. How completely the true nature of the situation was misunderstood by those at a distance, is shown by his expressing the hope that friendly relations between Texas and Mexico might be restored.⁵⁸ At the parade of the National Greys and the German Washington Guards for target firing, the mark adopted was an effigy of Santa Anna. This incident was made the occasion of a facetious editorial in the *Gazette* of May 10.

The report of Houston's victory at San Jacinto drew forth three hearty cheers from the members of the Philadelphia Exchange.⁵⁹ Major Theodore Gillies, of the artillery corps, took charge of a salute of 100 guns fired in celebration of Santa Anna's defeat on the afternoon of May 31. The firing took place on Broad Street after which the company marched to the Broad Street hotel, where

⁵⁶*Poulson's Advertiser*, April 27, 1836, quoting the *Charleston Southern Patriot*; *Philadelphia National Gazette*, June 22, 1836. The inducements held out by the Texas authorities to prospective volunteers occupy much less space in the Philadelphia papers than in those of some other communities, such as Kentucky for instance. Cf. *United States Gazette*, January 18, 1836; *Philadelphia National Gazette*, April 21, 26, 1836.

⁵⁷*Philadelphia National Gazette*, April 28, 1836.

⁵⁸*Ibid.*, May 9, 1836. One writer expressed the opinion that public sympathy in the United States had been excited just in proportion as the butcheries of Santa Anna had become known. *Ibid.*, June 28, 1836.

⁵⁹*United States Gazette*, May 23, 1836.

they refreshed themselves.⁶⁰ The editor of the *Philadelphia National Gazette* had made merry over the contradictory reports which came back from Texas. "And nothing is, but what is not," had been his paper's comment on the subject of Texas news. Now he was puzzled no little at the first intimation of the victory of Houston and his men. In his issue of May 17 the very idea of victory was ridiculed.⁶¹ The editor was greatly afraid the brilliant news was premature, and admonished his readers to take it "cum grano salis." At the same time he ventured the prediction that if the war continued, emigrants would pour into Texas determined to avenge their countrymen. Two days later his paper announced the "glorious news" was all a myth,—it was merely one of those stories hatched in the South for the purpose of producing an effect.⁶² But the good news persisted in coming, backed up by official proofs; so in his paper of May 28, the truth of the "glorious news" was at last acknowledged. But the old settlers were robbed of the glory of the victory by a fiction copied from the Mobile papers: "It is said there were not fifty Texians in the battle; that the Texian army was composed almost entirely of volunteers." The editor now went far towards atoning for his unsympathetic attitude on the Texas question in the following manner: "In contemplating the brilliant results of such a conflict, the blood flows quicker; we almost lose sight of the original grounds of controversy, and scarcely stop to enquire which party was right or wrong. Human hearts, properly tuned, will revolt at cruelty and barbarity; and a feeling of sympathy will always be experienced in free bosoms at the success of a leader like Houston." The *Gazette* of June 11 contained Houston's official account "of his extraordinary victory."⁶³

It only remains to glance at the attitude of the Philadelphia papers on the question of the neutrality of the United States government during the months following Houston's victory. The

⁶⁰*Philadelphia National Gazette*, May 30, June 2, 1836.

⁶¹The *New Orleans Bee* of May 3 contained Secretary of War Rusk's account of the battle, dated April 23.

⁶²*Philadelphia National Gazette*, May 19, 1836. The issue of May 23 still discredited the victory.

⁶³The day before the editor had referred to the "Massacre of the 21st of April."

National Gazette of May 18, in commenting upon certain official communications which passed between our government and the Mexican, used the following language: "The above correspondence shows on the part of the Executive a sense of our neutral duties and obligations, and a disposition to act up to them, honorable to the national character, and greater than from incidental disclosures we were disposed to give the Administration credit for." The *United States Gazette* agreed with the *National Intelligencer* that President Jackson's letter to Governor Cannon of Tennessee was as important as the proclamation of neutrality made by President Washington in 1793.⁶⁴ The *National Gazette* found the conduct of General Gaines upon the border decidedly reprehensible,⁶⁵ though it is difficult to see just wherein this reprehensibility lay, inasmuch as Gaines did not occupy Nacogdoches till the following July. This advance on the part of Gaines was due to his fear of the Comanches and other Indian tribes making common cause with the Mexicans against the exposed settlements on the southwestern frontier. Hence his resolve to punish whoever employed Indians against the people of either side of the imaginary line which confined the disputed territory.⁶⁶ The *Gazette* prophesied disaster and bloody consequences as the result of General Gaines's action, and in a lengthy editorial set forth the consequences of a war with Mexico.⁶⁷ It is now admitted that while Gaines's advance was technically not in accordance with international law, the step he took was "dictated by humanity and justified by the emergency."⁶⁸

The sober verdict of history has recorded that the Texas revolution was "a legitimate measure of self-defense" against the despotism of Santa Anna.⁶⁹ That the revolution succeeded was due in part to the moral and material assistance rendered the struggling Texans by the citizens of Pennsylvania.

⁶⁴*United States Gazette*, August 19, 1836.

⁶⁵*Philadelphia National Gazette*, May 6, 1836. The hope is expressed that nothing will be done by an American officer to tarnish the high character of the United States for national probity and good faith.

⁶⁶Cf. *United States Gazette*, August 2, 1836, which contained Gen. Gaines' letter of July 28 to Gen. Bradford.

⁶⁷*Philadelphia National Gazette*, August 2, 1836.

⁶⁸Garrison, *Westward Extension* (*Amer. Nation*, XVII), 88.

⁶⁹Smith, *The Annexation of Texas*, ch. I.

ALLEN'S REMINISCENCES OF TEXAS, 1838-1842¹

I

EDITED BY WILLIAM S. RED

ROCKVILLE, INDIANA, Dec. 4th, 1876.²

A friend has sent me the *Texas Presbyterian* of November 17th, containing Dr. [James Weston] Miller's Historical Discourse before the Synod at Dallas.³ I was glad to read it. It reminded me of old times. I would like to correct some dates, and supplement some other things. Hugh Wilson and I went [to Texas] about the same time, in the spring of 1838—Wilson to St. Augustine, I to Houston, in March. [John] McCullough arrived in November, six months after I did. I served as Chaplain to Congress, which met soon after my arrival. I had the place of W. W. Hall, who had returned to Kentucky. McCullough and I served as Chaplains to Congress which met in November, 1838. In the spring of 1839, I organized the Church in Houston, with ten members. In Oct., 1839, I organized a Presbyterian church in Austin, with six members, and administered the communion, six months before Dr. [Daniel] Baker arrived in Texas, and reported it to Presbytery at its first meeting. The Indian troubles drove the Government from Austin to Washington. Of course, the little Church was

¹These reminiscences appeared in the *Texas Presbyterian* at intervals from December 4, 1876, to January 2, 1885, while the paper was issued from St. Louis and edited from Texas. They were printed in the form of epistolary correspondence and are arranged in this compilation in the order in which they appeared in the *Presbyterian* with the exception that the articles concerning Joseph Brown, Henry S. Foote, James Burke and the University are carried forward from among his notes to a place at the close of the reminiscences. The compiler has taken the liberty of omitting some letters which treat of events current at the time when the reminiscences were prepared. Mr. Allen was over seventy years of age when his reminiscences were produced and the correspondence extended over almost ten years. As might be expected repetitions have appeared, and these repetitions have been retained where their omission would leave obscure some new data presented. For W. Y. Allen's career in Texas see THE QUARTERLY, XVII, 43-44.

²*Texas Presbyterian*, I, No. 40. December 22, 1876.

³The sermon was in commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the synod of Texas. It is also printed in *A Family of Millers and Stewarts*, by Robert F. Miller, Pp. 16-18.

scattered, and Dr. Baker reorganized it after the troubles passed away. After Presbytery adjourned, Dr. Baker and I spent two weeks in the neighborhood, preaching at Independence, Washington, Chriesman's, and as far west as Fuller's.⁴ We had a glorious time. Twenty-five or thirty conversions. Then, Baker and I went down to Columbia and Brazoria. The following autumn, I organized the Columbia Church with fifteen members. McCullough organized the Church at Galveston, shortly before the meeting of Presbytery, in April, 1840. The original minutes of the Presbytery, I sent, several years since, to the Presbyterian Historical Society of Philadelphia.

The most of the year 1841, I spent in Kentucky, begging money to pay the debt on the Houston church building, which was occupied by my worthy successor, Dr. Miller, not long after I had dedicated it.

I had been in Texas six months before Fullenwider went there with his family. In Sept., 1838, I met him in the streets of Natchez, on his way to Texas on horseback.

In 1842, I left Texas, a victim of chills and fever. The only thing like salary I received while in Texas, was while as Chaplain to Congress. I went there with about six hundred dollars, and left with just enough money to pay my way to Louisville. But I have never regretted what I did and suffered for Texas.

Your types have S. F. Cooke as one of the early ministers. It should be Stephen F. Cocke, an old fellow student of mine in Centre College, forty-six years ago.

Miller speaks of crossing a river on a hog trough and two puncheons, getting to a meeting of Presbytery. McCullough and I crossed the Brazos once, going to Independence to a meeting, on a little raft made of scantlings, that hardly kept us and our saddles and saddlebags above water. We hired a boy to swim our horses over.

ROCKVILLE, IND., Feb. 13th, 1878.⁵

MESSRS. EDITORS: Some one has recently sent me several numbers of this paper [*The Texas Presbyterian*]. In these, I notice with much interest the "Minutes of the Brazos Presbytery." It

⁴Longpoint, Washington county.

⁵*Texas Presbyterian*, III, No. 2. March 1, 1878.

seems that I am the only survivor of that little company that met in "Chriesman's School House"—Wilson, McCullough, Allen and McCorkle,⁶ "we four and no more." The sermon, the prayers, the basis, the resolutions—how well I remember them! The sainted Baker joined us, as a corresponding member, on Monday. Our business was not tedious. This gave us more time for preaching. Brother McCullough left us soon after adjournment. Brother Baker and I remained for three weeks, preaching every day, extending our labors from Fuller's to Washington; sometimes together, and then apart; a blessed time, and some thirty professed conversions during the meetings. Then, Brother Baker and I went from Independence to Columbia, spending a week in Brazoria County. Then, the Bells, the McCormicks, the Hills, the Pattons, and others were gathered into a Church, during that year. There, I baptised a grandmother, her daughter and her grandchild, on the same occasion. During that meeting, a man came, bringing his daughter fifteen miles. The daughter had never heard a sermon before.

My visit to Austin, in Oct., 1839, where I found a town very much in the woods, with five or six hundred people, in cabins and shanties and camps, I well remember. We gathered a little company in the largest room in the place, in Bullock's hotel, where I preached in the morning; and, in the afternoon, I organized that little Church of six members—two or them elders; and administered the communion to twelve or fifteen persons of different churches. We could not have an evening service because Gen. Burleson, with about seventy soldiers, came in about dark and occupied our room. Then, the yellow fever was raging in Houston and Galveston. It broke out in Houston just after I had left for Austin. We had organized the Church in Houston the previous March, with ten members, one elder. The Sabbath School, we had started in May, 1838, soon after my arrival, with twenty-six pupils.

On no part of my past ministry, do I look back with more pleasure, than "my four years work for Texas." Three Churches organized, and the house of worship in Houston built and dedicated, constituted my last work there.

⁶The ruling elder was John McFarland.

I preached the second sermon ever heard on Galveston Island, now nearly forty years ago.

*The Whartons.*⁷—In July, 1838, I took a horseback ride from Velasco to Houston. In company with a young man, an acquaintance of the Whartons, I spent a night at the beautiful residence of Col. Wm. H. Wharton, making a very pleasant acquaintance with Mrs. W. The Col. was not at home. Their son, John, was then a little boy. That visit has been a pleasant remembrance ever since. The following Oct., the whole family removed to Houston to spend the winter, Col. Wm. H. Wharton being a member of the Senate, and his brother John, a member of the Lower House. I was a frequent visitor at their house. Very soon after the meeting of Congress, Col. John A. Wharton was attacked with his last sickness. I was Chaplain of the Lower House. The attack of fever was severe. I was sent for to visit the sick brother. He requested me to write a report for him on Education, he being Chairman of that committee, and not able to do it himself. I had a few words with him on the subject of religion. I was requested to repeat my visit, which I did, when he requested me to pray for him, and to instruct him as to the way of life, saying he had been brought to think of the great subject as he had never done before. I was not allowed by his physicians to see him again. He soon afterwards died. He had been intensely sceptical. After his death, I learned that his mother had been a devotedly pious woman.

Wm. H. Wharton, who died the following summer, though professedly sceptical, was a scholarly gentleman, and made a beautiful speech in favor of the circulation of the Bible, at the organization of the Houston Bible Society. And now they are all gone. The last time I saw Mrs. W. and John, was at the house of her brother, Leonard Gross [Groce]. I have pleasant remembrance of the hospitality of the Whartons and the Groces.

Mar. 29th, 1878.

*Dr. Levi Jones.*⁸—Just forty years ago this week, I landed in Galveston. Soon after casting anchor, Dr. Jones came aboard the

⁷*Texas Presbyterian*, III, No. 3. March 15, 1878.

⁸*Texas Presbyterian*, III, No. 7. April 12, 1878.

schooner in which I had sailed from New Orleans. He was the first man that I met in Texas, that I had ever seen [before]. I knew him as a medical student in my boyhood. After entering his profession, he married a young widow, Mrs. Wardlaw, a member of the Church in Shelbyville, Ky., the Church in which I was brought up. They soon went to Anderson, Ky., where they resided many years. After I had been in Texas some time, the Dr. brought his family, his wife, and two daughters to Galveston. I was a frequent visitor at their house in Galveston, and have pleasant and grateful remembrances of their kind hospitality. I met a granddaughter of the Doctor's, a Miss Delano, of Henderson, lately while she was on a visit to Terre Haute. And now the Doctor has left his place among the living, following his wife and one of their daughters.

I notice that Temperance is receiving much attention among your people: I think I made the first temperance speech ever made on Galveston Island. It was made in a room in the old Clermont Hotel. The work bench was pushed to one side, the shavings pushed back, and seats extemporized, and the subject discussed for the first time in the young city. That was in 1839.

More than one thousand have put on the blue ribbon in Rockville, within a few weeks, seven thousand or eight thousand have done the same thing in Terre Haute. Many, in both places, among the very hardest cases. So much for Murphy! My first sermon in Galveston was preached in a cabin belonging to the old Texas Navy Yard. A second service, that day, was prevented by the arrival and salute of General Memucan Hunt, Secretary of the Navy, from the States. The salute called away everybody's attention. Davis was keeper of the Navy Yard; and Commodore Moore was Commandant. The Old Potomac was the only war vessel of the Texas Navy, at that time. I preached once on her deck.

Rockville, Ind., April 9th, 1878.

The Bells of West Columbia.^a—My first acquaintance with this pioneer family was on the occasion of the marriage of Mrs. Bell's daughter to Dr. J. Wilson Copes, about forty years ago. Mrs. Bell had been brought up a Presbyterian, in North Carolina, mar-

^a*Texas Presbyterian*, III, No. 9. April 26, 1878.

ried at the age of fifteen, and had not made a profession of religion at that time. She and her husband soon removed to Hopkinsville, Ky., thence to Red River, La., and thence, about 1820, they crossed over into Texas, with 6 and $\frac{1}{2}$ cents in money and two servants, a man and wife. They gradually worked their way down to the lower Brazos, and finally settled near Columbia, where I first met the family. The husband had died shortly before my first visit. They had become comparatively wealthy, and were widely known, and greatly respected for their hospitality to strangers and especially to any that were sick or suffering.

Mrs. B. had no doubt of her religious experience, years before I met with her, but had no access to a Presbyterian Church, and she would unite with no other, until I organized the Columbia Church in 1840. On my second visit to the neighborhood and before the Church was organized, I received her on profession of her faith, into the Church Militant, and baptised her youngest child and a little girl whom she had adopted. They were the first baptisms I ever performed. Her own child, a little daughter, died soon after. I had the privilege afterward of baptising her oldest daughter and her elder son, Thaddeus, on their own profession of faith in Christ, at the time of the organization of the Church, and, also, the brother-in-law of Mrs. B., Mr. McCormick, and all of his five or six children. Mrs. McCormick had united with the Church in North Carolina, before she came to Texas. I look back on no part of my forty-two years ministry with more pleasure, than that among the Bells and Pattons and McCormicks of West Columbia. It was interesting to hear Mrs. Bell tell of her early trials, self-denials during her early years in Texas—how, for weeks, they were without bread, living upon deer meat, and upon tea, sweetened with honey, and nursing a child at the same time.

I have heard nothing of the Bells, except the Judge, for a long time, but I do remember them and their kindness still.

*The First Temperance Meeting in Houston.*¹⁶—I have spoken of my first Temperance effort in Galveston. In Houston, my first effort was brought about in this wise. In the spring of 1839, Dr. John Breckinridge was on a visit to Houston. He had preached on a Sabbath with great acceptance, to a crowded audience, in the

¹⁶*Texas Presbyterian*, III, No. 11. May 10, 1878.

Senate Chamber of the Capitol. The next day, as I was passing along the street near the Capitol, I heard my name called. Looking across the street, I saw General Houston and Dr. Levi Jones sitting together on a piece of building timber. The General called to me to come over. When I came to them the General said "Allen, I want you to have a Temperance meeting called for tomorrow (Tuesday) evening, that Dr. Breckinridge may make us a Temperance speech; and I want to make one myself." This surprised me, for at that time the General was anything but a temperance man. However, I bestirred myself, and, with the effort of others, we had a large crowd. It was arranged for the General to speak first, and he made a grand speech in which he enlarged upon his own experience—told the people "to do as he advised, not as he had done." But when he got agoing it was hard for him to quit. He held on so long that Dr. Breckinridge had to postpone his address until the next evening. After General Houston's speech, a constitution and papers for the signers of the pledge, having been previously prepared, while some preliminary matters were going on, the General left the Hall so that he escaped the embarrassment of refusing to sign the pledge, in accordance with his own advice. Nevertheless there were a goodly number of signers that evening, and the next, after the very able address of Dr. Breckinridge. So much for the beginning of the Temperance work in Houston if not in all Texas.

The First Bible Society.—The First Bible Society of Houston was organized during the winter previous, in Jan., 1839, while Congress was in session. An agent of the A. B. S. had come. His name was Hoes. Had brought a number of Bibles with him. I worked for him for several days and we had a large crowd. There were several good speeches, one especially notable by Col. Wm. Wharton, then a Senator. I am glad to see the cause still lives and grows in that wide field. And though I may not say "*magna pars fui*," yet I am glad I had any part in the first movements of the Bible and Temperance work in Texas.

Rockville, Ind., May 7th, 1878.

*Alone All Night on the Prairie.*¹¹—Major Whiting had invited me to come over to his place on the Trinity, to marry his step daughter, supposed to be the richest young woman in the Republic of Texas. It was in April, 1839. I landed from steamer at Lynchburg and hired a man to take me in a skiff to Judge Burnett's, who was then living at the head of Galveston bay. The Judge loaned me a horse, after spending the night with him, to ride over to the Major's. The marriage took place at 12 m. From the reputation of the wealth of the bride, I thought it likely the house would be full of company, and that room might be scarce, so I halted in a grove, made my toilet, and rode up to the mansion, on the border of a beautiful lake, when lo! there was no company there. But they proposed, if I would stay until noon, next day, they would send around and have something of a wedding. I consented, but concluded to cross the Trinity and spend a part of the afternoon in Liberty. A considerable crowd was gathered the next day. The couple were married, and I returned to Judge Burnett's for the night. The Judge sent me round to Lynchburg in his boat. The steamers were all up the bayou, and the chances were that I would have to stay at Lynchburg for three or four days for a boat. The prospect was not flattering, for at that early day, heat and dust and fleas were said to abound there. So I concluded to try it afoot, at least as far as Harrisburg. I was set over the San Jacinto bay near the famous battle ground which had often been pointed out and the battle described, from the decks of steamers as they passed, by those who had been in the battle. I met Frank Lubbock on the bank of Buffalo bayou, got a lunch and was off again. Before reaching Harrisburg, I took a cattle path instead of keeping the road, bore off southwest, changed my course about sunset, crossed Green's bayou on a fallen tree, and soon struck out of the timber into the prairie which seemed to stretch on indefinitely. After dark, I lay down on the wet grass, but soon found that I was getting cold and stiff. I got up and walkd on until 2 o'clock a. m., then struck timber, sat down by the root of a tree, went to sleep, and, after daylight, soon found myself in a road, discovered where I was, about four miles west of Houston, and walked on to town. It was

¹¹*Texas Presbyterian*, III, No. 13. May 24, 1878.

Sabbath morning. I rested awhile, went and got some strong coffee, then went to the old Senate chamber and preached, and also at night, and in a week was shaking with chills and fever. But I had got an idea of solitude on that prairie such as I had never had before.

*Two Nights and a Day with a Pirate.*¹²—Recent notices of LaFitte, the pirate, have brought to mind one of my Texas adventures. In the fall of 1840, I left Galveston City, on horseback, for a visit and preaching tour on the Brazos. The forenoon was pleasant, but soon after noon it began to rain, and then to blow from the north. Riding down the island on the gulf shore, the last house then was twelve miles from the lower end of the island, except a shanty at the end of the island next to the pass, which I had expected to cross, and spend the night at San Louis, on which some Galveston men were starting a town. But the norther had raised such a commotion in the pass that there was no crossing that night. The shanty was occupied by an old man whose name I cannot recall, and who was said to have been one of LaFitte's pirates. I rode up to his shanty, cold, wet, and hungry. Asked him for shelter. He said he had nothing to eat but beans—no bread, no meat, no flour, no coffee, no oysters to be had on account of the storm. The prospect was not flattering for a night of comfort, but it was decidedly unpromising outside. The old man said I might stay; so, tying my horse (or rather Col. Love's horse) on the grass, I sought the shelter of the shanty. In that shanty there was smoke and dirt, a dog and cat, a little fire, a great pile of ashes on the hearth, and the old pirate. A pot of beans had been simmering over the fire all day. After warming and drying awhile, the old man handed me an old plate and spoon, and asked me if I would have some beans. I said yes, thank you. He furnished a little salt, and this was the whole meal, and it was not bad to take after my twenty-five miles ride and the fierce norther of the afternoon. Then, the dirty bunk! the only alternative to the dirty floor! Fortunately, I had a Mackinaw blanket, in which, like Sancho's sleep, I wrapped myself all over and avoided contact with the filthy bunk. Next morning, it was beans for breakfast and beans in the afternoon, with some fishy birds he had shot and

¹²*Texas Presbyterian*, III, No. 16. June 14, 1878.

skinned and stewed; and, then, another night, and beans again for breakfast, and then a silver dollar to pay for my entertainment, and, then, I got away.

Rockville, Ind., July 2nd, 1878.

*The Church in Houston.*¹³—I commenced my ministry in Houston, in March, 1838. There was then no church organization in the place, although they counted the population at two thousand. Congress met in April, in adjourned session. Rev. W. W. Hall, the Chaplain of the Senate, had left the Republic and returned to Kentucky. I was chosen in his place. Rev. Littleton Fowler, Chaplain of the Lower House, was in attendance, but was sick most of the time, so that I had to do most of the praying for both Houses, and nearly all of the preaching. After Congress adjourned in May, Mr. Fowler returned to the Red Lands, and I was the only minister within a hundred miles of the coast, until November following. Then, I was Chaplain again to the Lower House, and Rev. John McCullough, in the Senate, of the Second [Third] Congress. After Congress adjourned, in the spring of 1839, Mr. McCullough went to Galveston, and I remained in Houston. After laboring about a year in Houston, I organized the Presbyterian church of Houston, consisting of ten members. James Burke was chosen ruling elder and installed. He had been an elder in Mississippi. We had a communion, in which about fifteen persons participated—one or two Baptists, one or two Methodists and at least one Episcopalian, Mrs. Fairfax Gray, an excellent Christian woman. To me, it was a most interesting occasion. It was the first communion I ever conducted. It was a "day of small things" for the Church in Houston. It was the third Presbyterian church organized in the Republic. The little band soon set about the building of a house of worship. The work went on until January, 1841, when, to secure aid to finish the building, I went to Kentucky, and during the following spring and summer I raised about six hundred dollars, which enabled the brethren to complete the house, which I dedicated the following winter, the last of my four years work in Texas. During which time, I had spent about \$500.00 which I had taken with me. I had no salary except as Chaplain to Congress. When I left to beg money for the church,

¹³*Texas Presbyterian*, III, No. 21. July 19, 1878.

I had just enough money to take me to Kentucky. Now I understand that the First Church in Houston has two hundred and twenty members, and that a Second church has been organized.

*The Presbyterian Church in Austin.*¹⁴—In October, 1839, just as the yellow fever was breaking out in Houston, I set off on a visit to Austin, a town about four months old. I had sent on an appointment some time before. I bought an Indian pony and took in a campmeeting, at Rutersville, on the way. The campmeeting was in brother Alexander's field. He was a good preacher and an excellent man. He was aided by an old brother Haynie, a Doctor of Medicine, as well as preacher. He reminded me of Dr. Gideon Blackburn in his personal appearance. Also, a brother Clark, from Tennessee, was present. I spent Saturday and Sabbath and part of Monday with the brethren, preaching once at the camp, and at LaGrange on Sabbath evening. Spent a night at Bastrop, preaching there, thence, in company with James Burke, to Austin, arriving there Saturday about 10 o'clock a. m. A company was just gathering to go out to Brushy creek to bury the bodies of the men killed a few days before by the Indians. They were of the Webster party, whom the Indians had killed. I saw Mrs. Webster and her little girl a year after she had made her escape from the savages. Truly her's was a tale of hardship.

On Sabbath, I preached in a large room of Bullock's hotel. In the afternoon, we had another meeting, when we organized the First Church in Austin. There were six members. Mr. Bullock and James Burke, who had come to stay, were chosen ruling elders. They had both been elders before. We then had the communion, in which perhaps a dozen took part. It was truly a small beginning, and fell into a syncope afterwards, when the government and many citizens abandoned the Capital, alarmed by the Indians, and ran off to Washington. Dr. Daniel Baker gave the cause a new start. In his Biography, he speaks, or his son does for him, as if there had been no organization previously. But I have given the true history of the planting of the Presbyterian church in Austin.

The communion, that afternoon, in that large unfurnished room of the Bullock house, was something that had never been witnessed so far southwest by Protestants, on the American conti-

¹⁴*Texas Presbyterian*, III, No. 22. July 26, 1878.

ment. This was reaching out to the "regions beyond." That was the second communion at which I presided. And that was the fourth Presbyterian church in the Republic. Rev. Hugh Wilson had organized one near San Augustine, the first in the Republic, and one at Independence, the second; the Church of Houston, the third; and the one at Austin, the fourth. Galveston church was organized soon after. The Presbyterians were the first to set up their banners in those three principal centers. After the communion at Austin, Brother Clark, who had come on from Rutersville, and I walked up on Capitol Hill, and looked over the young city of perhaps six hundred inhabitants—after viewing and talking awhile, Bro. Clark said "Let us kneel down right here and pray for Texas." We kneeled, and I led in that prayer. We were in a little clump of bushes. Eighteen years after that prayer, i. e., in 1857, I was in Austin again, and the Capitol was standing on the very spot where Brother Clark and I had prayed in October, 1839. We could not have a third service on that Sabbath day, because General Burleson came in about dark, with some seventy soldiers, going after Indians, and they occupied the large room in the hotel. I slept that night with the soldiers on the floor of that room. The yellow fever had made dreadful work in Houston and Galveston, while I was on that visit to Austin.

Rockville, Ind., Aug. 7th, 1878.

*The Houston Presbyterian Sabbath School.*¹⁵—Some friend recently sent me a pamphlet, containing an account of the present condition of the Presbyterian Sabbath School of some thirty teachers and six hundred pupils on the roll. I had the honor of organizing that school in May, 1838, more than forty years ago. At that time, there was no other Sabbath School in the Republic. There was a tradition that Judge David G. Burnet had started a Sabbath School some years previous, but it had died out, probably during the revolution, and while the Judge was provisional President. The school in Houston was begun with twenty-six pupils and three or four teachers—James Baily and a Bro. Robinson were two of them. The names of the others I have forgotten. We were poorly supplied with books; testaments and readers and primers were the

¹⁵*Texas Presbyterian*, III, No. 26. August 23, 1878.

only books. It was a day of small things for the Sabbath school work in Houston. But it lived and grew; and, nineteen years afterwards, in 1857, on my last visit to Texas, I found six Sabbath schools, some of them large schools, in operation in Houston. It was my privilege to look in upon our school, after the nineteenth anniversary, and speak to them of their small beginning, and bear witness to the success of the enterprise. Brother Baily had worked with it and for it during all those years; and of all the original teachers he was the only one left, and was working in it still. On that visit, I had the pleasure of meeting with the Methodist Sabbath School at a May-day picnic, in the country.

Soon after my arrival in Houston, in March, 1838, A. C. Allen made me a present of a town lot, near where the jail was standing twenty years ago. I had a small room built upon it, where I studied, and slept on a sack of prairie hay. Several months, in 1839, I shared my room and bed with Mr. Chapman, the Episcopal Deacon, who was the first Episcopal preacher of Houston. He had the Grays and the Bees and the Rileys as his followers, while I had the Burkes and Bails and Coans and Robinsons. Having no salary, I boarded around considerably, as the ancient schoolmasters used to do. Five months at half price with Woodruff; a good deal of my time gratis, at A. C. Allen's, at Baily's, at Millett's, etc. Frequently off on excursions to Galveston, to Velasco, to Quintana, to Brazoria, to Columbia, to Richmond, to Independence, etc., spreading my work, but making Houston my headquarters. How I would like to see all these places again, and note the difference between now and then! If some Texas railroad king would send me a free pass I would be tempted to take a run to the Lone Star State, and do some preaching there again. I was at the first railroad meeting ever held in Texas, and opened the meeting with prayer. Moseley Baker made the speech and dug a hole, and the Masons planted a post, as a beginning of a railroad; that was in 1840.¹⁶

*My First Marriage Ceremony in Texas.*¹⁷—Col. Hockley introduced me to Col. R., who said he wished to see me at Col. W.'s,

¹⁶This was probably the Harrisburg and Brazos Railroad. See *THE QUARTERLY*, VII, 279-281, and Potts, *Railroad Transportation in Texas*, 26-27.

¹⁷*Texas Presbyterian*, III, No. 27. August 30, 1878.

in the course of an hour, to perform a nuptial ceremony. Of course, I was prompt at the hour, 12 m. The bride was Mrs. D., a young widow. The groom, a large portly looking and rather venerable man. The witnesses were Col. W., his wife, Col. Hockley, and one or two others. It was a very quiet affair, though the City of Houston was full of people, it being the first day of the adjourned session of the First [Second] Congress, in April, 1838. The married couple took their departure for Galveston by steamer within an hour. Nothing was said of wedding fee, and I had concluded that the service was altogether gratuitous. After the adjournment of Congress, during which I had acted as Chaplain to the Senate, I visited Galveston for a few days, stopping with the family of Dr. Lewis [*sic*] Jones. Coming in one afternoon, Mrs. J. handed me a package, which had been left for me by Col. R. and his wife. The package contained six linen shirts! And though nothing had been said by way of explanation either to the family or myself, I accepted the gift as the *wedding fee*—my first in "The Lone Star Republic."

Another Matrimonial Reminiscence.—Mr. H., a young lawyer of Richmond, a Kentuckian, engaged me to meet him at the house of Mrs. C., near Velasco, eighty miles from Houston. The time was August. I made Capt. Bingham's, twenty-five miles the first day, on Clark Owen's mustang. At Bingham's, I met some of the wedding guests from Richmond. We started at 2 a. m., next morning, and made twenty-five miles for breakfast. The ride was pleasant enough until sunrise, when the mosquitoes rose upon us from the wet prairie in immense swarms, and made it lively for us until nine o'clock. The heat then settled them for the rest of the day until sundown. When we arrived at Mrs. C.'s, they were smoking chips and green weeds all around the house, to keep off the tormentors, the only drawback to a pleasant marriage scene. Such were some of my experiences of forty years ago, now pleasant to recall.

*Allen's Ordination.*¹⁸—A Presbytery and campmeeting were held at Valley Creek church, a few miles from Selma, Ala., in Nov., 1838, just forty years ago. Junius B. King and I had passed our

¹⁸*Texas Presbyterian*, III, No. 40. November 29, 1878.

final examinations for ordination; King to be pastor of the Valley Creek church, and I to go to the "regions beyond" as an evangelist to Texas, where I had spent the previous six months. *Jetur* had preached the sermon under a large shed used for meetings when too large for the church. King and I had knelt, while the "hands of the Presbytery" were laid upon us and the ordaining prayer was offered, Nall and Witherspoon and Martin and Hamilton and Frazer and Holman taking part.

Then, we stood up, while Nall gave us solemn charge, King as pastor of the flock among whom we were meeting, and me as evangelist to Texas. To me he used these words, standing tall and erect and pointing his long forefinger, giving emphasis to his words: "Now, brother Allen, we have ordained you as an evangelist, to go and preach the gospel in the Republic of Texas. Now, Bro. Allen, never let the word come back to us that Bro. Allen has turned speculator."

I have thought of those words many a time since that solemn occasion and, though often tempted, I never turned speculator. I was reminded of the charge, by seeing Bro. Nall's name in a recent *Texas Presbyterian*. He and I had been fellow students for a year in Centre College. During that year, he had formed the acquaintance of the young woman who afterwards became his wife. She was then in school in Danville. Apropos of North Carolina, where Nall was at last mention, Mrs. Bell of West Columbia, who was brought up under the ministry of an eminent preacher, Dr. Hall of N. C., told me that Dr. Hall was troubled with fits of melancholy. Sometimes, he thought he had no religion, would neither preach nor pray, but would attend all the prayer meetings in the church kept up by the Session; and, one Sabbath day, an earnest old Scotch Irish elder was praying and said with great earnestness: "O Lord, cast out the dumb devil from our dear pastor, that he may open his mouth as heretofore and preach the gospel to us," and immediately the Doctor sprang to his feet and began to exhort. The dumb devil was cast out. Are there not many who are possessed with dumb devils, who ought to pray and preach?

Rockville, Ind., Dec. 4th, 1878.

*First Written History of the Republic of Texas.*¹⁹—In 1839, while the Second [Third] Congress of Texas was in session in Houston, the Rev. A. Lawrence, editor of the *New Orleans Presbyterian*, and a gentleman named Stille, a publisher of Philadelphia, came to Houston. They wished to get up a history of the Republic. They asked for the use of my room, a shanty on the edge of the town, for three or four days. Lawrence put into writing what meagre information each of them had picked up by inquiries among the people, as they happened to meet them. And, lo! a history of Texas! the result of four days writing, and the authors were off, Lawrence to his tripod in New Orleans, and Stille to publish the little work in Philadelphia. I do not think I ever saw it after it left my room in manuscript.²⁰ Of course, it was too soon to write a history of Texas, while Houston and Lamar and the Whartons and Rusk and Kauffman and most of the actors in the revolution that made Texas free were still active in the affairs of the new Republic.

The College.—About the time the above mentioned history was written, Col. Wm. H. Wharton, then a Senator in Congress, spoke to me about the establishment of a University in Texas, and paid me the compliment of proposing that I should be put at the head of it. This was as near as I ever came to being a President of a University! In 1840, the Rev. W. L. McCalla set Galveston all astir on the subject of starting a great University in the Island City. It was at the time of Dr. Baker's first visit to Texas, and to him, in after years, Austin College owed more than to any other man. May the College take and hold root in its new location, and send out a healthful influence all over the State.

Rockville, Ind., Dec. 17th, 1878.

*Dr. Daniel Baker.*²¹—I met this eminent minister and friend of Texas, while I was connected with Centre College, before he settled

¹⁹*Texas Presbyterian*, III, No. 43. December 20, 1878.

²⁰The book, to whose preparation reference is here made, was published in 1840 under the title: "*Texas in 1840; or The Emigrants Guide to the New Republic*. By an emigrant, late of the U. S." It did not pretend to be a history, nor was it the first book about Texas.

²¹*Texas Presbyterian*, III, No. 45. January 3, 1879.

as pastor of the Frankfort church. He came to Danville during the session of the Synod of Kentucky and preached several times during the Synod. His grand sermon, on "The Mediatorial Glory of the Lord Jesus Christ," made an impression not readily forgotten. It was one of a few sermons preached by him a great many times. He preached it many times after it was printed. Several of his sermons, which were published under the title of "Revival Sermons," I heard half a dozen times in different places, as in Danville and Shelbyville, Ky., in Mobile, also in New Orleans, and in Houston, Independence, and Columbia, Texas. I remember having heard him say he had five hundred sermons prepared with as much care as those which he preached so often. These, he must have prepared during his various pastorates. He was too hard a worker to have made new sermons while doing evangelistic work. His short talks at prayer meetings and his anecdotes were all written and memorized with great care. I have never met with any man who could deliver a sermon for the hundredth time, with all the freshness and unction of a first delivery. The last time I met him was as a delegate to the General Assembly at St. Louis, in 1851.

Rockville, Ind., Jan. 27th, 1879.

*Frazier.*²²—His name was Frazer, [Frazier] a Cumberland Presbyterian minister. He was from the "Red Lands," had just been elected Chaplain to the Lower House [Senate] of the Second [Third] Congress of the Republic, when he was stricken with a mortal disease. He lingered but a short time. I had been with him most of the time of his sickness. Had performed his duties as a Chaplain. And now had come the last hours of his sufferings, and they were terrible sufferings. It was now midnight, and he was not to see the day dawn again on earth. I had talked and prayed with him, and was now standing, silently looking for the last struggle. Beside me stood a Houston merchant, one of the profanest and most ungodly men of the city. We were alone, watching with the dying man. The heart of the wicked man all at once seemed to be touched with a gleam of natural benevolence, and, leaning over the dying man, he exhorted him to "trust in Jesus." He had heard that Jesus was a friend that could help, when all

²²*Texas Presbyterian*, III, No. 52. February 14, 1879.

human helpers had failed. Physicians could do nothing more. We who stood by could do nothing but sympathize, and the wicked man said "Trust in Jesus," though he had never trusted in Him himself. "Let him that heareth say come."

While at breakfast at Woodruff's one morning, a messenger came in haste, saying that a woman, not far from the old Capitol, wanted to see me, supposing that she was dying. When I got to her bedside, she thought that she was better, and her alarm was gone. She seemed to take but little interest either in my conversation or prayers. I left her and before the day closed she was dead.

Another sad case: After a hard ride on horseback, through rain and mud from Velasco, tired and travel soiled and hungry, I alighted at the hotel in Brazoria. I was recognized by some one passing by. Presently, a messenger came, saying a woman near by was dying, and wished to see me as soon as possible. I went immediately, and found her in intense agony from internal cancer, which had already siezed upon the vitals. She was a wife and a mother. Her first words were: "Oh, I am dying, and I am not prepared, and my agony is such that I cannot think. My parents were professed Christians, but they never warned me to prepare for death, and now, I can't prepare." I prayed with her then, and next morning left for Columbia. Came back after a week. She was dead, having no ground for hope for the future.

Rockville, Ind., Feb. 14th, 1879.²³

Rev. Mr. Hutchison [*Rev. Francis Rutherford*].²⁴—The first member received into the Brazos Presbytery, after its organization, in May, 1840, was the Rev. Mr. Hutchison. It was our fall meeting, in Nov. 1840. Brothers Wilson and McCullough, Elder McFarland and myself, the four original members, had met according to adjournment, in the neighborhood of Independence, where Brothers Wilson and McFarland lived. Soon after my arrival at Brother Wilson's, word came from Hoxie's, in the neighborhood, that Brother Hutchison was there, and had just been attacked with lockjaw.

I had met him at Quintana, the previous summer, had heard him

²³*Texas Presbyterian*, IV, No. 2. February 28, 1879.

²⁴The Minutes of the Presbytery of Brazos record the death of the Rev. Francis Rutherford under the circumstances here given. No Mr. Hutchison is mentioned. Mr. Allen evidently forgot the name.

preach once at a school house in Quintana, his wife died during the fall. They were recently from Mississippi. Shortly before the Presbytery was to meet, he had taken an excursion out to the region of Goliad. At the house of a man named Alexander, he had trodden on a rusty shingle nail, which pierced the thin sole of the shoe and also pierced his foot not far from the toes. Neglecting the wound, he had ridden fifty miles to his home on the lower Brazos, and then started immediately on the ride of a hundred miles to meet us in Presbytery, with the design of becoming a member. He stopped at Hoxie's, and died at *Tetanus*, in three or four days. I attended the meetings of the Presbytery, during the day, at Chriesman's school-house, and watched with Hutchison at night. At his earnest request we enrolled his name as a member, though he never met with us. The night after Presbytery adjourned, he died. Only his physician and myself were present when he died. We buried him in the Independence cemetery, while his wife slept on the banks of the Brazos. That was the last meeting of the Brazos Presbytery that I attended.

I think Rev. W. C. Blair's name was enrolled as a member at that second meeting, though he was not present. I alone am left of the original members of the mother Presbytery. Now, they have become five bands.

*Texas Newspapers.*²⁵—When I arrived in Houston, in March, 1838, there was but one newspaper in the Republic.²⁶ That one was the *Houston Telegraph*, managed by Cruger and Moore; the latter, principal editor. It was a very respectable paper both as to size and matter and altogether creditable to the owners and managers as well as to the young Republic.

During the summer of 1838, [Hamilton] Stewart, from Scott County, Kentucky, who came to Texas shortly after I did, and was a fellow boarder at Woodruff's for a time, went to Galveston, after the close of the first [second] Congress, and started the *Galveston Civilian*. It was quite a small paper at first, as was Galveston itself at that time. But forty years have made a difference in the appearance of the Island.

²⁵*Texas Presbyterian*, IV, No. 3. May 7, 1879.

²⁶The *Matagorda Bulletin* was a contemporary of the *Telegraph*. The issue for March 28, 1838, is number 33 of volume I.—THE EDITORS.

There were McKinney and Williams and Levi Jones and Gail Borden and Col [James] Love and Moseley Baker, who were not likely to let things lie still. McKinney and Williams were rebuilding their warehouse, which had been smashed by a vagrant schooner the previous autumn. Gail Borden was running the Custom House, while Jones and Love were speculators. Fifty dollars would then have bought many a desirable lot in the Island City.

The San Louis Advocate.—Some Galveston speculators determined to have a town on the little island in the pass between the lower end of Galveston Island and the main land. They called the new town San Louis, and, early in 1840, Tod Robison started the *San Louis Advocate*. It was intended to help make the town. Tod engaged me as correspondent, at the rate of five dollars per column, small wages in Texas money at that time. I wrote for the paper until I had earned fifty dollars, and then called on Tod for my pay, but got not a red, not even a promissory note.²⁷ If San Louis still lives and flourishes, it ought to pay that fifty dollars.

During the first session of the Second Congress, James Burke issued a very small daily. It was about a duodecimo, and was printed by Whiting, who was then public printer. These were the pioneer newspapers of the Republic.

Rockville, Ind., Feb. 28th 1879.

Education in the Republic.²⁸—I notice some stirring writing, in the *Texas Presbyterian* of this week, on the subject of Education. I am sorry to hear the charge of indifference to the subject by so large a portion of the population. Let me give a reminiscence on the subject.

In Nov., 1838, the Second [Third] Congress of the Republic met in Houston. In the appointment of the House Committees, Col. John Wharton was first on the Committee of Education. A few days after Congress met, he was laid upon a sick bed. His disease proved fatal in a few days. I was then Chaplain of the House,

²⁷A few copies of the *Advocate* are among the Austin Papers. They contain some articles written in the style of Allen but signed with a *nom de plume*, Themis.

²⁸*Texas Presbyterian*, IV, No. 3. March 7, 1879.

and, at his request, visited him several times during the earlier stage of his sickness. During one of those visits, he requested me to write a Report for the Committee on Education, of which he was the Chairman. In compliance with his request, I wrote an extended Report, urging the importance of the early attention of Congress to make timely and ample provision for education, as the only safe ground of hope for the permanent prosperity of the Republic, and to foster such measures as would raise the vocation of the teacher to respectability and honor. After Col. Wharton's death, I handed the Report to the next member of the Committee, supposing that, of course, he would be the chairman. But the member who was appointed in Col. Wharton's place claimed the Chairmanship, took the paper that I had prepared, wrote a page or two by way of introduction, and had it and my paper read as being all his own, without a word of explanation. He was from the Red Lands, I have forgotten his name.²⁹ I suppose the Report is still in the archives of the Republic, in my hand writing.³⁰ If the Wharton brothers had lived, I think the cause of education would not have slumbered so long.

P. S. In a former reminiscence, I made mention of Wm. H. Wharton's proposal, during that Second [Third] Congress, to take measures for the founding of a University for the Republic. And now, after forty years, the fifty or sixty students of Austin College is rather a poor showing for a population of two million. Austin College has changed its place. Rutersville, the senior, changed its character, and of Baylor, I am not advised.

Rockville, Ind., Mar. 4th, 1879.

*How I Traveled in Texas Forty Years Ago.*³¹—From New Orleans, I went over the Gulf in an old schooner, the "Johannes," started at 9 p. m. A dense fog stopped us opposite the "Battle ground." Next morning, took a "tug" and went to the mouth of the river. Next morning, Sabbath, went out into the great Gulf. Arrived at Galveston Wednesday noon. Paid thirty dollars. Thurs-

²⁹Ezekiel W. Cullen.

³⁰An investigation did not locate the manuscript. The body of the report is in Allen's style.

³¹*Texas Presbyterian*, IV, No. 6. March 28, 1879.

day took passage on steamer, "Friendship", for Houston; paid fare. Paid no more fares by steamer, all the time I was in Texas, except once from Galveston to New Orleans. Four trips on steamer gratis. Once, went down the coast from Galveston to Velasco, on the little "Correo," broke a shaft, and had to anchor off the mouth of the Brazos. In the morning, began to drag anchor. Signal of distress brought a little schooner to take us off. One time, I went from Velasco to Galveston in a small schooner with a cargo of two hundred bushels of sweet potatoes.

My first horse back ride in Texas was from Velasco to Houston, in July, 1838, on a pony that Anson Jones had ridden from Houston when he was sent by Sam Houston to Washington. On that trip I got my first and only taste of the "cut throat grape"—didn't try it any more. That ride in July cost me a spell of fever. To make my journey to Austin, in Oct., 1839, I bought an Indian pony for \$100.00, "promissory notes", about fifty dollars par. Got the pony badly hurt at Gross's [Groce's] as I came home, and sold it for \$40.00 promissory notes. On that trip I preached at Ruttersville campmeeting, at LaGrange, at Bastrop, and at Austin, organizing the church in Austin, and at Gross's [Groce's] and at Dr. Davis's across the river on my way back. It was then, the yellow fever was raging at Galveston and Houston. My next horse speculation was in the fall of 1840. I started on a foundered horse, belonging to Independence, and, after going several miles, instead of getting better he got worse. So I left Bro. McCullough to go on by himself, and I went back to Houston, bought a mustang pony for \$12.00 par, got dinner and started again for Independence, and overtook Bro. McCullough at midnight. After making my journey to Presbytery and back, I sold my mustang for \$10.00 par, a better speculation than the other. In those times, it was but little trouble to borrow a horse for a few days. Welshmeyer offered me a very fine horse to make my trip to Presbytery, in May, 1840, and asked me to keep him for a month. I paid a ten dollar gold piece, a wedding fee, for a stage ride from Velasco to Galveston, nearly twenty cents a mile, the highest fare I ever paid. That stage line did not last long.

W. Y. ALLEN.

P. S. I send the above that you junior brethren may see some-

thing of the variety and difficulties of travel of the seniors. The most imminent perils I encountered were from high waters, twice on the Brazos, once on Green's bayou, once on Oyster Creek, and once getting around a top in the Gulf. But the "hand unseen" preserved me, and I continue unto this day.

CORRESPONDENCE FROM THE BRITISH ARCHIVES
CONCERNING TEXAS, 1837-1846

IX

EDITED BY EPHRAIM DOUGLASS ADAMS

ABERDEEN TO ELLIOT¹

Draft.

F. O. Sept. 18th 1843.

Captain Elliot.

No. 11.

Sir,

Your Despatches to No. 22 inclusive have been received and laid before the Queen.

With reference to your Despatch No 11 in which you convey the desire expressed by the Texian Govt that a British Consul Agent should be appointed at Corpus Christi Bay, I have to inform you that H. M. Govt. do not consider that such an appointment is necessary as yet.

KENNEDY TO ABERDEEN²*Strictly Private.*

British Consulate.

Galveston. Sept 23d. 1843.

My Lord,

I had the honor to transmit to Your Lordship on the 29th of last Month, by Her Majesty's Sloop of War "Scylla," proceeding from Galveston to Vera Cruz, the copy of a Map of the Island of Mugeris, with the Survey of the Coast and Harbour, made by order of the Texan Commodore for the use of his Government.

Referring to my despatch marked "Private" and dated *August 6th*, I beg to state that I have *seen* the Signature of M. de Saligny, Minister from France to Texas, attached to a document to be used by the party holding it in the event of M. de Saligny's death. This document is in acknowledgment of certain claims of the holder to be recognized by France in case she shall obtain possession of the island in question.

¹F. O., Texas, Vol. 6. The letter is unsigned.²F. O., Texas, Vol. 7.

Referring to my despatch marked "Private" and dated *September 6th*, I have to inform Your Lordship that recent accounts from the United States tend fully to establish the accuracy of the information conveyed to me by my Correspondent at New Orleans, and, in all important particulars, communicated to Your Lordship in that despatch.

It may be proper to mention that M. de Saligny has been absent in Europe more than a year, that the duties of French Chargé d' Affaires are discharged by a *locum tenens*, and that the friends of M. de S. in this place profess to anticipate his early return to his post.

William Kennedy.

The Earl of Aberdeen, K. T.

ELLIOTT TO ABERDEEN³

No. 28.⁴

My Lord,

I have had the honor to receive Your Lordship's despatch No. 10 inclosing the copy of a despatch to Mr. Percy Doyle dated on the 1st July.⁵ It has always appeared to me that the Course of the people of this Country concerning the final adjustment of their difficulties with Mexico will be entirely controlled, or at least mainly influenced by the purposes and proceedings of the Government and people of the United States.

Her Majesty's Government will have better means of judging of those purposes and proceedings than I can furnish from this quarter. But I can certainly perceive no grounds for modifying the opinions I have already had the honor to submit that the acknowledgment of the Independence of Texas by Mexico has always been ill liked by the present Government, and a large part of the people of the United States; that such a Solution has become much more unpopular throughout the whole Union, since it

³F. O., Texas, Vol. 6.

⁴*Ibid.* Elliot to Aberdeen, Nos. 26 and 27, September 15, 1843, have been omitted. No. 26 treated of the *Eliza Russell* claims. No. 27 enclosed Houston's proclamation of September 4, 1843, permitting any Mexicans in Texas to repair to headquarters of General Woll, and also on this topic a copy of Jones to Elliot, September 4, 1843. This last in Garrison, *Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas*, III, 1125, in Am. Hist. Assoc. Report, 1908, II.

⁵See page 193, note 4, above.

has been supposed to be favored by the Government of Her Majesty, and that of the King of the French; and lastly that if General Santa Aña be brought to act upon a material suggestion of Your Lordship's despatch 1st July to Mr. Doyle, this question will at once become one of great importance in the Affairs of this Continent.

Your Lordship is no doubt aware that there is considerable and growing uneasiness upon this subject throughout the South Western part of the Union, and the reports which reach us here through the press of the United States and other sources are noticeable because of the evidence they afford of that state of inquietude. We hear of the rights of Louisiana to all the territory as far West as the "Nuecas," of the determination of the people of that State to assert those rights for themselves if the General Government does not otherwise effectually interpose for the breaking up of any arrangement menacing, in their view, the stability of their Slave Institutions, of the renewal of General Jackson's negotiations for the purchase of Texas, and a variety of other rumours of the like nature.

It is commonly said here too, that the Conversation of the new Chargé d' Affaires from the United States, near this Government, (General Murphy), is unreservedly hostile to a settlement of the difficulties under any other auspices than those of his own Government, and I learn that at a late festive meeting he addressed a large assembly as his "Fellow Citizens." I take the liberty of mentioning this incident to Your Lordship, and [not?] that I attach much importance to it, for if His Government had any immediate purposes in view, this Gentleman would probably have been more circumspect than he seems to have been; but it causes a state of general feeling which I have thought it right to place under Your Lordship's attention. Indeed I would wish to mention that whilst it is my conviction that nothing can be more settled than the disinclination of a large part of the people of the United States to any adjustment of the affairs of Texas and directly carried out by their own Government and [not?] in what they understand to be their interests, it is equally my habit to receive the details of any reported project with the utmost reserve, and I certainly have had no means of forming any safe opinion as to the manner of interference in these concerns.

I am of course sensible that much that is said and written in the United States on the subject deserves no attention, but I believe that I have made no mistake as to the real state of feeling in respect to it, and I have considered it proper at this conjuncture to repeat the impression.

It is to be supposed that this uneasy treatment of the acknowledgment of the Independence of Texas by Mexico upon liberal arrangements with respect to the Slave population, must help to satisfy Genl Santa Aña of the soundness of that course for the strength and safety of his own Country. And if he bases his policy upon that condition, granting an amply sufficient period to this Government for deliberation, and liberal limiting proposals, (for it will need both time, and favorable concomitant terms to prepare the people to adopt such a combination) I believe he will succeed in accomplishing a signal political triumph, lastingly honorable to his fame both as a Statesman, and a benefactor of Mankind.

One great practical advantage of the proposal of Mexico to acknowledge the Independence of Texas upon the condition to which Your Lordship has adverted, would be the indisposition of the Slave holders of the United States to bring any more of their people into this Country with the prospect of that conclusion before them, or with the prospect of a renewal of hostilities upon such a ground, if Texas refused such a condition. It is a very material consideration in this subject, that the Cotton growing capabilities of Texas are superior to those of the United States; and if the principle of free labor can be established here, what with the opportunity of procuring labor from Mexico, and by immigration from other quarters, and the increasing supply and improvement of the Staple from India, there would be very soon an end of the remunerative production of Cotton by Slave labor in the United States.

The supply from Texas this year will amount to nearly 100,000 Bales (a considerable portion of it the produce of free labor) and if peace can be secured upon the terms Your Lordship has suggested, I entertain no doubt whatever that the Supply from Texas will exceed a Million of bales within 10 years from the date of such an arrangement. That supply must be exchanged chiefly against British Manufactures; And unless the tariffs of the

United States, and the recent one of Mexico are very soon abated, it is easy to foresee that this Country will rapidly come to be the Seat of a considerable trade.

Charles Elliot.

The Earl of Aberdeen, K. T.

P. S.

I shall take the liberty of providing a Copy of this despatch to Mr. Doyle.

C. E.

ADDINGTON TO ELLIOT⁶

Draft.

F. O. October 3, 1843.

Captain Elliot.

Sir,

In reply to your despatch marked "*Separate*" of the 4th of Augt. in which you request to be transferred to some other post, on the ground of ill health, I am directed by the Earl of Aberdeen to acquaint you that His Lordship regrets that he can not hold out any hopes of being enabled to comply with your request; but His Lordship directs me to add that if you are desirous of obtaining temporary leave of absence for the restoration of your health, His Lordship will very willingly grant it.

ELLIOT TO ABERDEEN⁷

Private.

Galveston. October 10th 1843.

My Lord.

I have the honor to acquaint Your Lordship that the Commissioners from this Government for the Settlement of the difficulties with Mexico, Mr. Samuel M. Williams and Colonel George Hockley will sail for Matamoros tomorrow or next day.

Their immediate object will be the arrangement of the terms of the Armistice, but I collect from them that they will not be able to go on to Mexico till Congress here shall have meet and sanctioned the necessary appropriation

I beg leave to forward herewith the Copy of a letter of introduction⁸ which I have taken the liberty to give the Commissioners to Her Majesty's Chargé d' Affaires at Mexico, as also the copy

⁶F. O., Texas, Vol. 6. The letter is unsigned and unnumbered.

⁷F. O., Texas, Vol. 6.

⁸Not transcribed.

of another private letter addressed to that Gentleman by this occasion.

Charles Elliot.

The Earl of Aberdeen, K. T.

ELLIOT TO DOYLE⁹

Private.

Galveston October 10th 1843

My dear Sir.

The departure of the Commissioners for Matamoros affords me an opportunity to write to you a few lines. You will observe by the extracts from the American papers in the accompanying Newspapers that they are rather excited upon the subject of British interference in the Southern Sections of that part of the World.

I trust that Mexico will be true to the great cause of humanity, and to itself, on this momentous occasion. The mere announcement of their just and honorable determination that a land which was free under their rule should not be turned into a Pen of Slaves for the convenience of persons possessing such property in the exhausted Slave States of the North American Union would of itself be a very important step towards the establishment and security of the due and needful weight of Mexico in the affairs of this Continent. They have but to signify that the sine qua non conditions of their acknowledgment of Texas by Mexico are decided and approved measures for the early and final disappearance of Slavery here, and formal adherence to the declaration of Mexico that the Independence is recognised and understood to be *complete*, whilst Texas remains a Separate Nation, but if [of] non effect in the case that it should annex itself to any other Country, without the consent of Mexico. Such a policy on the part of Mexico in the present emergency will have the effect of turning evil into good to it's lasting honor, and disaster into safety and advantage, interposing more effectual barriers against encroaching purposes from the other side of the "Sabine," than the best lines of military defence, maintained in strong force, and the most effectual manner.

I said in my note to you a few days since that I am satisfied General Santa Aña may consent to a truce of very liberal dura-

⁹F. O., Texas, Vol. 6.

tion (it matters not how long) if He causes it to be publicly understood at the same time that no combination of circumstances would ever induce Mexico to conclude a definitive arrangement with Texas till perfectly satisfactory arrangements were made for the Abolition of Slavery within some reasonable space of time, and on the contrary that Mexico is prepared to adjust finally on the most liberal footing as soon as that difficulty is removed.

No more Slaves will be brought into Texas after such a declaration of the Mexican Government, and the tide of immigration from the Slave States will be at once arrested; but there will be, instead, a very large immigration from the free States of the Union (orderly people that come to work for their bread in peace, not to idle away their time in the hope of profitable adventure into Mexico), and from quarters in Europe well affected to Mexico, chiefly directed to the frontier conterminous with Mexico, which is the region of Texas best suited to European Constitutions. If hostilities are resumed again (a very unlikely event after such a declaration of the Mexican Government), that Government would find itself in an attitude of great importance and force in this part of the World. The people of the United States are given to keen speculative calculation, and that prospect would present to them the possibility of Mexican Arms marching forward into Texas with proclamation that Slavery had no legal existence *as far West as the "Sabine,"* that the disabilities of people of Colour whether of the mixed Indian or African races were in like manner non-existent within those limits, that the lands in Texas held by Settlers not possessed of Slaves, or willing to manumit them, should be confirmed to them provided they hold themselves neuter to the contest, and finally that sympathy from the S. W. States of America would be answered with sympathizing invitations to the Black and Coloured people of all races in those regions to pass over to the right bank of the "Sabine" where they would find less talk about the rights of Man, and a little rational enjoyment of them. Such reflections as these would assuredly present [a barrier?] to the blustering part of the population here and in the United States, immediately upon the public signification of the policy of the Mexican Government to have fast peace with Texas as soon as Texas saw fit to place Itself in a really independent attitude, as respected the S. W. States of America, in-

stead of one of advanced post of aggression against Mexico, which it will continue to be till Mexico has the sound wisdom to sever the tie that connects Texas with those States.

Added to the high honor and other force that Mexico would derive from this policy, there should be joined the reflection of that certain distraction and violence as in the Councils of the United States sure to follow any attempt of the S. W. States to force on a War with Mexico, arising out of any just measures for it's honor and safety, as to the Abolition of Slavery in Texas, which was a violation of the Constitution of Mexico from it's very commencement. The best and wisest Statesmen of the United States fully comprehend that it is for the well understood interest and safety of their own Country that Slavery should not be suffered to extend in a S. W. direction. They are opposed to it both on lofty moral principle, and upon grounds of policy; and if Mexico acts upon the suggestion which has been made from London, I believe there need be no serious apprehension of anything worse than a great deal of talk. If there be any unreasonable faltering in that particular, I believe on the contrary that the intrigues which I am persuaded are ripening, will occasion some very serious inconvenience.

I make you no excuse for troubling you with these thoughts because I am sure you will feel that I do so in some hope they may help the public Service, and I need not say that it will give me great pleasure to attend to any suggestions which you think may serve the like purpose in this quarter

Charles Elliot.

Copy

Charles Elliot

[Endorsed] Inclosure No. 2. in Captain Elliot's private despatch to the Earl of Aberdeen Octr. 10th 1843.

KENNEDY TO ABERDEEN¹⁰

No. 7.

British Consulate.

Galveston October 11th. 1843.

My Lord,

I have the honor to enclose a Return in duplicate of the prices

¹⁰F. O., Texas, Vol. 7.

of Indian Corn, Cotton and hides at the Port of Galveston, for the Quarter ending 30th. Ultimo.

I shall take an early opportunity of transmitting a General Report respecting the Trade of this Country, which I have held over, for the purpose of rendering it as correct as possible. To arrive at statistical accuracy in an extensive and thinly peopled Country, where intelligence is not always enlisted on the side of truth, and where the Machinery of internal administration is of necessity very imperfect, is an extremely difficult task.

William Kennedy.

The Earl of Aberdeen, K. T.

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

The Viceroy of New Spain. By Donald E. Smith (University of California Publications in History, Volume I, No. 2, Pp. 99-293. Berkeley: 1913.)

To one who is looking for an exhaustive treatment of the office of viceroy in New Spain, this book will prove to be somewhat disappointing. Although the title would lead the reader to expect a general study, the author does not claim to have attempted to treat the viceroy throughout the entire period of that official's existence in New Spain. On the contrary, he states, in his conclusion, that his work deals only with the functions of the viceroy "as they were in the closing years of the Spanish reign." With such an avowal as this, it would be manifestly unjust to criticize Dr. Smith's book in the light of the broad and more comprehensive title which he uses. It would doubtless have been better, however, had he indicated the narrow limits of his work in the title itself.

As a matter of fact, the study made by Dr. Smith is confined almost entirely to the period from 1789 to 1803, comprehending the administrations of Revillagigedo, Branciforte, Azanza, and Marquina. A glance at the footnotes reveals the paucity of primary sources to which Dr. Smith has had access. Indeed, the constant references to the *Instrucción Reservada* of Revillagigedo might cause the superficial reader to think that the book is little more than a digest or analysis of that important document. It is to be regretted that the author could not make use of the vast store of rich materials to be found in the Spanish and Mexican archives in the nature of unprinted sources, for until such documents have been utilized, the final word cannot be said even upon the brief period of which Dr. Smith's book treats.

The author begins his study by presenting a summary of the history of the office of the viceroy in Mexico from its establishment to the time of Charles III, which includes a very helpful brief exposition of the changes wrought in the office of viceroy by the introduction of the intendancy system in 1786. The body of the work consists of five chapters, whose contents may be indicated as fol-

lows: Chapter II treats of the relations of the viceroy with the home government; Chapter III, of the functions of the viceroy as governor; Chapter IV, of his functions as captain-general; Chapter V, of his functions as vice-patron of the church; and Chapter VI takes up more in detail the reforms of Charles III that are mentioned in the introductory chapter, especially the so-called free trade decree of 1778 and the decree of intendants of 1786.

In considering the relations of the viceroy with the home government, Dr. Smith departs from the limits he has set himself, showing the connection of the viceroy with the various institutions of the Spanish colonial system. He has added nothing to the accounts given by Bancroft, Moses, and Desdevises du Désert, although he has done a service in presenting the facts in a more accessible form. He takes exception to the view held by Desdevises du Désert that the viceroy was an oriental satrap, and shows that, on the contrary, he had practically no independence, being subject to the constant interference, even in the most trivial matters, of the home government. Here again the author depends almost entirely upon the *Instrucción Reservada*, and does not attempt to characterize the viceroy of an earlier period. In discussing the duties of the viceroy in connection with the negro slave trade, Dr. Smith says that it was by means of this traffic that the Spaniards were able to avoid the enslavement of the Indians in New Spain, since they could import sufficient laborers to produce an ample supply of food. Negro slavery, however, played a very small part in the economic system of New Spain, comparatively speaking, and it certainly did not prevent the Indians from being reduced to a state of practical slavery or serfdom.

In his chapter on the viceroy as governor Dr. Smith says: "There was little real danger to Spain of losing her American empire as the French lost Canada, as long as her rule was acceptable to the great mass of the colonial population, and thus the real problems before the viceroy were civil ones" (p. 160). He seems, however, to take an entirely different view when he comes to discuss the viceroy as captain-general, and points out, what seems to be more in accordance with the true facts, that the military functions of the viceroy completely overshadowed his civil duties. "On the eve of Spanish-American independence," he says, . . . "the viceroy was becoming more and more exclusively a military ruler" (p. 194).

Again, he quotes Revillagigedo as saying that "by the last decade of the eighteenth century the powers which belonged to him as captain-general were not only more distinctive, but more important than those which he possessed as governor, as vice-patron, or as superintendent-general of the *real hacienda*" (p. 196). Dr. Smith goes on to make in this same chapter what appears to be a more correct statement of the international situation than the one referred to above. He says: "After the experiences of the Seven Years' War, Spain realized the possibilities of serious trouble from the English, who had taken Manila and Havana in 1762, and had generally terrorized the Spanish-American coasts." Again: "The expedition of the English against Buenos Ayres in 1806 showed that the Court of St. James was in earnest in its designs upon certain parts of the Spanish colonial dominions." These statements, together with many others of a similar nature, seem to indicate that the real opinion of the author is that, on account of the danger of foreign aggression, the viceroy in the period of which he treats was primarily a military and not a civil official. Indeed, Dr. Smith could not more emphatically state his belief that such was the case than when he says that the military functions "were the very heart of the viceregal office and were historically and actually the most important things which the viceroy was called upon to do" (p. 228). The excellent account given of the organization of the militia system of New Spain in the last years of the eighteenth century (and how difficult such a task is only one familiar with the field can realize) is a welcome contribution, and clears up many obscure points concerning the methods of controlling the disorganized forces of the viceroyalty during this period. In this connection, we might wish that Dr. Smith had been more specific in describing the functions of the various officials and councils that co-operated with the viceroy in matters of defence. Such important features as the *auditor de guerra* and the *junta general de guerra y hacienda* are passed over without explanation of their peculiar duties. We should have liked to see also some discussion of the viceroy's duties in regard to the frontier provinces, to which only indirect reference is made.

The absence of any table of contents, index, or sub-headings in the text makes the reading of the book rather difficult. Various

repetitions are to be noted, and some carelessness is apparent in the use of "*ibid.*" in the footnotes.

On the whole, Dr. Smith has written a book which will prove of value to those interested in Spanish colonial institutions. Since it is a pioneer work in its particular field it is not surprising to find some shortcomings, which however will not prevent its being of use to the student who wishes to work along the same lines and make a more general study of the office of viceroy than Dr. Smith has professed to attempt.

W. E. DUNN.

John Brown, Soldier of Fortune: A Critique. By Hill Pables Wilson. (Lawrence, Kansas: Hill P. Wilson. 1913. Pp. 450.)

This volume was evidently written as a protest against the conclusions of Mr. Villard in his recent work, "John Brown, A Biography Fifty Years After," but it is based upon studies begun many years ago. Mr. Wilson holds that Villard's book, though scholarly, is fundamentally unsound because the author has constantly endeavored to explain Brown's career and to justify his acts in accordance with the traditional view, and that, in doing this, he has suppressed or neglected evidence which would have led to very different conclusions. Mr. Wilson's own conclusions are that Brown was a horse-thief in Kansas, and a military adventurer at Harper's Ferry, hoping by the aid of a slave insurrection to establish a military empire in the South. This view was reached as the result of investigations begun with the purpose of writing a eulogistic sketch of John Brown's career in Kansas.

The book will repay careful reading. Following the lead of Villard, the author reviews Brown's varied business career in 1852, and reveals a number of shady transactions with the idea of portraying the character of the man. He also makes it clear that Brown showed no discernible interest in the slavery question prior to 1850 and then only incidentally. Having failed in business in 1854, the next year Brown followed five of his sons to Kansas as a settler, bringing along by request some arms for the free-state men furnished by the abolitionists. After examination of the evidence, the author declares that Brown took no conspicuous part as a free-state leader; but that, discouraged by the gloomy outlook for farming, he plotted to steal horses, organized a small band for

that purpose, committed the murders on the Pottawatomie to cloak the theft, and exchanged the horses thus acquired for "fast running horses from Kentucky." As proof of Brown's sense of guilt in this, he always denied participation in the crime. So far from taking a prominent part in the warfare with the pro-slavery men, Brown was present at only two engagements, Black Jack and Osawatomie, in both of which he was overtaken while endeavoring to get away with stolen horses and cattle. He even left Lawrence on the eve of an expected attack by the pro-slavery forces (September 14, 1856).

Brown's campaign in the East, October, 1856, to November, 1857, for funds with which to equip a company of men for warfare in Kansas, Mr. Wilson stigmatizes as a "colossal graft upon free-state sentiment," the more palpable because conditions in Kansas were becoming peaceful. Though he raised the funds, Brown did nothing in Kansas except to make a raid into Missouri for more plunder.

About this time Brown conceived the plan that carried him to Harper's Ferry two years later. Believing that a slave insurrection would be easy to start, he began training a band of his former confederates, men of desperate character, for the conquest of the South. He plotted to seduce United States soldiers from their allegiance, and drew up a provisional constitution for his proposed conquests, which was adopted by a convention of his followers in Canada.

The fiasco at Harper's Ferry was due to the failure of the slaves to rise. Here Villard is taken severely to task for total misapprehension of Brown's plans, which Mr. Wilson thinks were not ill-advised except for the reliance upon the negroes. Brown's courage after capture, his concealment of his real plans, and his assumption of the attitude of a martyr, together with the state of the public mind resulting from the Civil War, have beclouded the memory of his crimes and selfish aims, and built up the tradition which envelopes his name. In this a series of eulogistic biographers have played their part.

Mr. Wilson has without question made out a strong case for the prosecution. At times he weakens it by making too much of uncertain evidence and by sundry harsh criticisms of Mr. Villard for the omission of material that must have seemed to the latter

unimportant or irrelevant. But, on the whole, it is a very salutary corrective for much of the customary laudatory twaddle about John Brown, and it will have to be reckoned with by the students of the subject.

CHAS. W. RAMSDELL.

L'Amérique Latine. République Argentine. Par Eugenio Garzón. (Paris: Bernard Grasset, 1913. Pp. xvi, 386.)

The appearance of the third edition of this work is sufficient proof of the favor with which it has been received. The author is one of the most prominent of the large colony of South Americans who have taken up their residence in Paris, and he has won much distinction in his adopted country. The present edition of his work consists of two parts, as indicated by the title. The first one hundred and fifty-two pages are devoted to a study of the period of the Spanish-American wars of independence. The causes of the break with Spain are clearly set forth, and the progress of the struggle traced down to the triumph of the colonial armies. There is practically no change in this portion of the book from the previous editions. The second part of the book, however, which deals exclusively with the Argentine Republic, has been thoroughly revised and brought up to date. It will appeal to the economist and business man rather than to the historian. A list of some of the topics discussed will show the scope of the book: Geography and climatic conditions, agriculture, cattle-raising, mining, immigration, foreign commerce, refrigerated meats, manufactures and industries in general, mining, government finances, banking and currency system, immigration, public instruction, and the army and navy. Statistical tables and a number of unusually fine maps and diagrams show in graphic form the recent development and present resources of the great South American republic, and make the book a valuable reference work for those who are interested in the more practical questions of business conditions there today.

W. E. DUNN.

NEWS ITEMS

Professor H. E. Bolton of the University of California will offer courses in Southwestern History in the University of Texas during the summer session of 1914.

The first number of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* will appear in June, 1914. Professor Clarence W. Alvord of the University of Illinois is managing editor. It will be devoted primarily to the publication of articles and the reviewing of books on the Mississippi valley, but contributions will also be accepted "which may be interpreted as explaining the westward expansion [of the United States] in its broadest aspects." Correspondence concerning membership in the Mississippi Valley Association should be addressed to the Secretary, Clarence S. Paine, Lincoln, Nebraska.

THE SOUTHWESTERN HISTORICAL QUARTERLY

VOL. XVII*

APRIL, 1914

No. 4

The publication committee and the editors disclaim responsibility for views expressed by contributors to THE QUARTERLY.

THE FOUNDING OF THE MISSIONS ON THE SAN GABRIEL RIVER, 1745-1749

HERBERT E. BOLTON

It is not generally known that the San Gabriel River in central Texas was once the seat of Franciscan missionary activity. Yet such is the case, and slender remains of the mission establishments are still to be seen in the valley of that stream. If one will drive nine miles northwest from Rockdale to the Kolb Settlement, and then turn westward up the river for about a mile, he will come to what has long been known in the neighborhood as "Ditch Valley Farm," a name, the present writer has discovered and established beyond doubt, which comes from the fact that through the farm once ran an "acequia," or irrigating ditch, constructed in the year 1750 to serve three Spanish missions which had recently been established there. In the river near by are still to be seen at low water the remains of what has long been known as the old "Rock Dam," whose origin, it is now clear, was the same as that of the ditch.

The remains of the "acequia" as well as of the dam are still to be seen in dim outline. Crossing the main highway near the western end of the farm is a shallow ditch leading toward the river. North of the road it is quite distinct, being some eight feet wide at the top and two or three feet deep in the middle. The land on this side of the road is uncultivated, and in the bed of the ditch are growing hackberry trees nearly a foot in diameter.


*Volumes I-XV published as THE QUARTERLY of the Texas State Historical Association.

About one hundred feet from the road the ditch terminates in a natural arroyo or gully, which leads eastward into the river about two hundred yards away. South of the road the ditch leads into cultivated fields, where it is soon lost; but forty rods to the south-east, where it crosses an unplowed lane, it is again distinct, and eighty rods farther away it can still be faintly traced across another lane.

In the bed of the river two hundred yards below the mouth of the arroyo the remains of the old "Rock Dam" are pointed out. They now consist of only a heap of large stones, stretching across the stream. A man fishing up the river at low water would certainly notice the stones, though he might not suspect that they are the remains of a dam. But the inhabitants of the neighborhood claim to remember when both ditch and dam were quite distinct—a claim fully supported by the long and commonly used names, "Rock Dam" and "Ditch Valley Farm." In the fields the "acequia" has been filled in by the plow; while most of the stones of the dam, I am told, have been hauled away and used for building purposes. Besides the ditch and the dam, tradition tells of the remains of old buildings of pre-American origin, once standing on Kolb's Hill, below Ditch Valley Farm. Tradition ascribes the ditch, the dam, and the old buildings to the Spaniards, and neighborhood belief in the tradition is evidenced by perennial digging about the locality of the dam for pots of Spanish gold. But few or none have guessed, what is now established beyond question, that these archaeological remains are the vestiges of what were known in their day as the San Xavier missions.

I. THE DAWN OF HISTORY IN CENTRAL TEXAS.

1. *The obscurity of the history hitherto.*—The story of these missions is a little known chapter in the history of the labors of the Franciscan Fathers among the Indians northeast of the Rio Grande. Writing a few years ago on "Some Obscure Points in the Mission Period" of the history of Texas, Dr. W. F. McCaleb said, with essential truth, "Though little is known of most of the eastern [Texas] missions, still less is known of some others. Indeed, as to the three missions on the San Xavier River, no historian, so far as the writer's information goes, save Bancroft, has



MAP OF THE MISSIONS SAN XAVIER

BASED ON THE ORIGINAL SURVEY MADE BY ECA Y MUÑOZ,
1750, AND A SURVEY OF EXISTING REMAINS
OF MISSION
PRESIDIO
DISTANCE FROM PRESIDIO TO JUNCTION OF SAN GABRIEL RIVER
AND BRUSHY CREEK NEARLY 4 1/2 MILES
BY HERBERT E. BOLTON

even mentioned their names."¹ And Bancroft, he might have added, devotes to them only a little more than a page. Besides Bancroft, Dr. McCaleb should have excepted Shea, who devotes a few short paragraphs to the subject.² Had the assertion been intended to include books printed in a foreign language it would have excepted, also, Arricivita's *Crónica Seráfica y Apostólica*,³ a very rare work, which contains a fairly good, though in many respects unsatisfactory, account of the missions, in whose founding and administration the author took part. Arricivita's worst defect is his utter disregard for chronology and geography. There is, in addition, the still rarer treatise, for it is as yet unprinted, by Father Morfi, which devotes a considerable amount of space to the San Xavier missions. This history and that of Arricivita are the chief basis of the brief and obscure paragraphs of Bancroft and Shea.⁴

Since Dr. McCaleb wrote the words quoted, no advance has been made in published works, excepting a minor contribution by the present writer.⁵ At the time when that was published, only Bancroft had even dared guess the identity of the San Xavier River, on which the missions were established. He conjectured that it might have been a branch of either the Colorado or the Brazos, a guess giving considerable latitude, since these streams are from fifty to seventy-five miles apart in their middle courses.⁶ Other features of the history of the missions have been equally or more obscure. Indeed, even the date of their establishment has not hitherto been correctly recorded.

And yet the reason for this obscurity is not that the missions

¹THE QUARTERLY, I, 221.

²See Shea, *The Catholic Church in Colonial Days* (1886), 500-501; Bancroft, *North Mexican States and Texas*, I, 623 (ed. of 1884).

³Mexico, 1792. Pp. 321-338.

⁴Morfi, *Memorias para la Historia de Tejas*, cir. 1781. A copy is in the Bancroft Library, and is now being edited for publication.

⁵The reference is to the article by the present writer entitled "Spanish Missions in the San Gabriel Valley" published in the *Williamson County Sun*, March 21, 1907. This article correctly identifies the site of the missions and gives a general outline of their history, but it contains some errors and is indefinite at points where definite information is now at hand. The same article was published contemporaneously in the *Rockdale Express*. It was written for the purpose of arousing local interest in the mission remains and obtaining local information concerning them.

⁶Bancroft, *North Mexican States and Texas*, I, 623.

were relatively unimportant, for they were more far-reaching in design, longer in duration, and more successful in operation than the San Sabá mission, for example, of which much more is popularly known. Nor has the reason been the non-existence of data for making the episode fairly plain, for these are abundant. It has been, rather, the inaccessibility of the data, and the fact that considerable material remains of the San Sabá mission have been preserved, whereas those of the San Xavier River have been completely lost to view. Recently, however, a large quantity of documentary sources for the history of the missions on the San Gabriel has been gathered from the archives of Mexico,⁷ and the site of the missions and some of their remains have been identified. It is now possible, therefore, to construct with some degree of fullness, on the basis of the newly acquired material and a study of the site, the story of the precarious career of these shortlived but not unimportant missions.

2. *The genesis of missionary activity in Texas.*—One fact which appears from a study of missionary activities in Texas in the light of the distribution and organization of the native tribes, is that mission development was not haphazard, but bore pretty definite relations to the tribal grouping. The opinion sometimes expressed that the Spaniards set out from the first arbitrarily to establish a "chain of missions" in Texas, is in the main unfounded. Mission distribution was conditioned, as we would expect upon reflection, by native organization, and the practicability of such a plan would depend largely upon the distribution of the native tribes.

The first group of Indians in Texas to receive serious attention from the missionaries were the Hasinai, or Asinai, of the Neches-Angelina country, among whom missionary activity was begun in 1690, and renewed and extended in 1716. About 1700, with the establishment of three missions on the lower Rio Grande, below the present Eagle Pass, work was begun among the large group of Coahuiltecan, or Pakwan tribes, who lived between the Rio Grande and the San Antonio. This enterprise led logically to the founding of missions at San Antonio, for the same group of tribes

⁷The larger part of them come from the archives of the extinguished College of Santa Cruz de Querétaro, which founded the missions and where they were discovered by the present writer. Specific references to the materials are given throughout this paper.

(1718-1731). Next, in 1722, a mission was established near Matagorda Bay for the Karankawan tribes of the coast, but it was moved inland in 1726 to the Xaranames and the Tamiques. At the same time that missionary work was begun among the Karankawa, attention was directed for a time to the Hierbipiamé, of the Brazos country, but without avail, as will appear shortly. After 1731, when the Querétaran missions were transferred from eastern Texas to San Antonio, there was no expansion into new missionary fields for over a decade and a half, although the old field gradually widened as a result of the efforts to supply with neophytes the missions already founded. By this time fifteen missions had been established in Texas.

The next seventeen years, between 1745 and 1762, that is, down to the time when Texas lost much of its political importance because of the acquisition of Louisiana by Spain, was another period of extensive missionary expansion within the present limits of Texas. During that period three missions were established on the San Xavier River, among the Tonkawan tribes; one was founded on the lower Trinity River among the Orcoquiza, one on the lower San Antonio for the Karankawa, and three on the San Sabá and the Nueces Rivers for the Eastern Apache. At the same time, attempts were made among the Wichita tribes of the upper Brazos and the Red Rivers.

In all this missionary work, activity was much influenced by the movements or the supposed movements of the French of Louisiana, who were constantly regarded as dangerous rivals among the Texas tribes.

3. *Early knowledge of the San Xavier River.*—The San Xavier River of Spanish days, it is now clear enough, was the San Gabriel of today, which joins Little River—the old San Andrés, or the first of the Brazos de Dios—some twenty-five miles before that stream disembogues into the main Brazos. The way in which the Spanish name became converted by a series of misspellings into the present form, with the resulting loss of the stream's identity in modern geography, is in itself an interesting bit of history, but cannot be indicated here. The San Xavier River early became known to the Spaniards as one of the streams of central Texas endowed with more than usually attractive surroundings. It was visited and given its name by the Ramón-Saint Denis expedition

on June 1, 1716.⁸ By the same party Brushy Creek, the principal tributary of the San Gabriel, was twice crossed and was given the name of Arroyo de las Benditas Animas⁹ (Creek of the Blessed Souls), which it bore in somewhat shortened form almost continuously throughout Spanish days.

From 1716 forward the San Xavier River was frequently visited and mentioned. The expedition led by the Marquis of Aguayo in 1721 passed the Colorado near the mouth of Onion Creek and followed a northward course that took the party across Arroyo de las Animas, the San Xavier River, Little River near Belton, and thence to the Brazos about at Waco.¹⁰ In 1730, when the Querétaran missions were removed from eastern Texas to San Antonio, the Zacatecan missionaries asked permission to remove their establishments to the San Xavier,¹¹ a fact which indicates some acquaintance with the stream. In 1732 Bustillo y Zevallos, governor of Texas, made a campaign against the Apache that took him to and beyond the San Xavier.¹² In 1744, during the perennial quarrel between the Canary Island settlers and the other inhabitants of San Antonio, it was suggested that one of the parties should move to the San Xavier,¹³ but the proposal was not acted upon. Two years later it was asserted that the region of the San Xavier was well known to the inhabitants of San Antonio as a buffalo-hunting ground,¹⁴ and anyone who has beheld the superb prairies

⁸Espinosa, *Diario derrotero de la nueva entrada a la Prov. de los Tejas, Año de 1716*, entry for June 1. It is seen that this expedition, led by Saint Denis, did not by any means follow the "Old San Antonio Road" of later days. The original of this rare manuscript is in the Archivo General y Público, Mexico.

⁹*Ibid.*, entries for May 28 and June 2.

¹⁰Peña, *Derrotero de la Expedición en la Provincia de los Tejas, Mexico, 1722*. This is the original government print. The copy in the *Memorias de Nueva España*, vol. 28, has numerous errors, and is there given a wrong title. I am indebted to the paper by Miss Eleanor Buckley on "The Aguayo Expedition" for the results of her study of Aguayo's route. This paper was her master's thesis written at the University of Texas, 1908-1909. Father Pichardo made a map of the route in 1811, which corresponds roughly to that made by Miss Buckley.

¹¹Informe al R. Discreto. de los PPs. Pres. y Misss. de Tejas en que piden salir al Rio de S. Xavier.

¹²Bustillo y Zevallos, Memorial del Govor. Bustillos en contra de la fundacion de Sn. Xavier, May 28, 1746, paragraph 7; Cabello, Informe, 1784.

¹³Cabello, *Ibid.*, par. 6.

¹⁴Ortiz, Satisfaccion de los Misioneros á las objeciones hechas por el Govr. Bustillos contra las fundaciones de. Sn. Xavier, 1746. This is a

between the Colorado and the middle San Gabriel can readily believe the assertion.

It is thus seen that in 1745, when the project of missions for the tribes of central Texas was broached, the merits of the San Xavier river and its surrounding country were not by any means unknown. Its natural advantages were many; its principal drawback was its proximity to the Lipan country, beyond the rugged hills on the west.

4. *First contact with the tribes of central Texas.*—But what interested the missionary fathers in any region more than its fertility and beauty, of which they were extremely good judges, was its natives. In this connection, it may be remarked that without the writings of the Catholic missionaries our ethnological knowledge of many portions of America would be almost a blank. This would be true of central Texas in the eighteenth century. In the course of the passage of the Spaniards to and from eastern Texas and of missionary excursions from San Antonio, several tribes became known on either side of the Camino Real, in the region between the Colorado and the Trinity. Conspicuous among them were the four bands which played the chief part in the inception of the San Xavier missions, namely, the group called *Ranchería Grande* (Big Camp or Big Village),¹⁵ the Mayeyes, the Deadoses, and the Yojuanes.

Ranchería Grande was a most extraordinary aggregation. At its basis the principal tribe was the Hierbipiamé, or Ervipiamé,¹⁶ for whom a mission had been founded in 1698 between the Sabinas and the Rio Grande, about forty leagues northwest of Monclova.¹⁷ It will be interesting to note in passing that the name given to this first, as well as to the second and third missions founded for the Hierbipiamé, was San Xavier. To just what territory the Hierbipiamé were indigenous does not appear. In the formation

memorandum of points by Father Ortiz and Father Espinosa in reply to certain objections raised to founding a mission on the San Xavier.

¹⁵These tribes were sometimes collectively called at San Antonio "the Eastern Indians."

¹⁶See articles by Bolton on "*Ranchería Grande*" and "*Ervipiamé*" in Hodge, *Handbook of American Indians*.

¹⁷Portillo, *Apuntes para la Historia Antigua de Coahuila y Texas* (Saltillo, 1888), pp. 269-271. These pages contain the *autos* of the founding of the mission, copied from the archives of Coahuila. The name given to the mission and pueblo was "San Francisco Xavier y Valle de Cristobal."

of Ranchería Grande there had been added to this tribe (1) the remains of numerous broken-down bands from near and even beyond the Rio Grande who had fled eastward and joined the Hierbipiame for defence against the Apache and to escape punishment for injuries done the Spaniards of the interior, and (2) many apostate Indians from the missions at San Antonio and on the Rio Grande. Because of the prominence of the Hierbipiame in that group, it was sometimes called "Ranchería Grande de los Hierbipiamas."¹⁸

Ranchería Grande was mentioned as early as 1707, when Diego Ramón, commander at San Juan Bautista, set out to punish it for disturbances at the missions on the Rio Grande.¹⁹ It was then said to be near the Colorado River, at that day called the San Marcos. Again, in 1714 Ramón secured from it apostates who had fled from the San Juan Bautista mission.²⁰ In 1716 the Ramón expedition passed through it north of Little River and two or three leagues west of the Brazos, apparently near modern Cameron.²¹ According to Ramón it then contained more than two thousand souls.²² In 1721 a chief of the Ranchería Grande, called Juan Rodríguez, was found by the Marquis de Aguayo at San Antonio, with a band of his people, asking for a mission. The Marquis took him as a guide as far as the Trinity River, where he found the major portion of his people mingling with the Bidais and Agdocas (Deadoses). Aguayo ordered the people of Ranchería Grande to retire across the Brazos, "where they were accustomed to live," promising to establish a mission for them near San Antonio on his return thither. True to his promise, in 1722 he founded for Juan Rodríguez and his band the mission of San Xavier de Náxera, on the outskirts of San Antonio, where the mission of Concepción now stands.²³ It endured, with little success, till 1726, when it was merged with that of San Antonio de Valero.²⁴

¹⁸Communication of Father Paredes, July 12, 1729. K, leg. 19, doc. 19, Archive of the College of Santa Cruz.

¹⁹Diary, 1707.

²⁰*Ibid.*

²¹Diaries of Espinosa and Ramón, 1716 (MSS.).

²²Ramón, diary of 1716.

²³Peña, *Derrotero de la Expedición*.

²⁴See Bolton, "Spanish Mission Records at San Antonio," in *THE QUARTERLY*, X, 298-300.

Though reduced in numerical strength by the drain made by the mission, *Ranchería Grande* continued to give much trouble to the missionaries, since it afforded a refuge for apostates from San Antonio, who must have tended to replenish its population. The missionaries complained that it was a veritable "Rochelle," and they earnestly requested that it should be either destroyed or Christianized. Its pernicious influence was thus described in 1729 by Fray Miguel de Paredes:

Not only do they impede new conversions, but they also destroy the reductions already established. . . . At present, Most Excellent Sir, since these Indians of the missions know that they have an open door, asylum, and protection in the *Ranchería Grande*, their flights have reached such an extreme that if their disorders are reprimanded or punished the least little bit, whether by the chiefs or by the missionaries, or if there should be any extraordinary labor—and many times without other cause than to seek their liberty—they flee to the said *ranchería*.²⁵

It has been seen that down to Aguayo's time this troublesome aggregation of Indians were "accustomed to live" west of the Brazos, near the Cross Timbers (*Monte Grande*). But pressure from the Apaches soon drove them to spend much of their time eastward of the Brazos. In testimony of this fact, Bustillo y Zavallas, who had been governor of Texas from 1732 to 1734, wrote in 1746 that "of *Ranchería Grande* there remained in my time only the name, for their abode being the *Monte Grande*, they had already, because of their diminutive forces, retired to live in the distance, between the *Yojuanes* and *Acdozas*,"²⁶ that is, between the *Trinity* and the Brazos. This seems to have been their principal haunt in 1745, when our story begins.

The habitat and movements of the *Mayeyes* were much the same as those of *Ranchería Grande*, in so far as those of either are known. In 1687 Joutel, La Salle's companion, heard of the *Meghy* as a tribe living north of the Colorado somewhere near the place where the Spaniards later actually came into contact with the *Mayeyes*,²⁷ and it seems not improbable from the similarity of the names and locations that the two tribes were identical.

²⁵July 12, 1729. K, leg. 19, doc. 19, Arch. Coll. Santa Cruz.

²⁶He says, "in the former time." He may mean the administration preceding his own. Memorial, May 28, 1746, par. 4.

²⁷Journal, in Margry, *Découvertes*, III, 288.

In 1727 Rivera encountered the Mayeyes at a spring called Puentezitas, fifteen leagues west of the junction of the two arms of the Brazos, that is, of the Little River with the main Brazos, and thirty-five leagues after crossing the Colorado. The place must have been somewhere near the San Gabriel River.²⁸ According to Bustillo y Zevallos, who was evidently speaking of them as he had known them in his day, the Mayeyes customarily came down from the Brazos de Dios to the Nabasota (Navasota), and ranged from there to the Trinity. As he had seen them several times, he probably spoke with authority.²⁹ A critical document now in the archive of the College of Guadalupe de Zacatecas, written anonymously about 1748 by someone who had had wide experience in Texas, evidently a Zacatecan friar, says that the country of the Mayeyes was on the east of the Brazos, eighty leagues from San Antonio and twenty from the "place of San Xavier."³⁰ The two designations agree essentially with each other and harmonize with the testimony of other documents.

The Yojuane are less easily traced. They were a wandering Tonkawan band, as were the Mayeye, and their general history was much the same as the better known Tonkawa tribe.³¹ They were mentioned by Casañas in 1691 as "Diu Juan," in a list of enemies of the Hasinai.³² In 1709 Fathers Espinosa and Olivares met a tribe called Yojuan near the Colorado River.³³ About 1714 they destroyed the main Hasinai temple near the Angelina.³⁴ The Joyuan tribe met by Du Rivage in 1719 near the Red River above the Caddodacho seem to have been the Yojuane.³⁵ Later on the Yojuane were closely associated with the Mayeye and the Hierbipame, and for some time before 1745 they lived northward of

²⁸Peña, *Derrotero*.

²⁹Memorial, May 28, 1746.

³⁰This document consists of a copy of the royal *cédula* of April 16, 1748, which authorizes the establishment of the San Xavier missions, and of critical comments on the tribes named therein. It is of great value for the tribal distribution of this region. I shall cite it as "Anonymous Commentary," Arch. Coll. Zacatecas.

³¹See Bolton, article on "Tonkawa" and "Yojuane," in Hodge, *Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico*.

³²Casañas, *Relación*, 1691. MS.

³³Olivares, *Diario*, 1709. MS.

³⁴Espinosa, *Crónica Apostólica*, I, 424.

³⁵La Harpe, *Relation*, in Margry, *Découvertes*, III, 616.

these tribes between the Trinity and the Brazos. Mediavilla y Ascona, governor of Texas between 1727 and 1730, stated that he frequently saw them on the road to eastern Texas. Bustillo y Zevallos, his successor in office, said that they lived "to the north-west, up the Trinity River, far distant from them [the Deadoses and Mayeyes] and neighbors to a tribe of Apaches called los Melenudos." Before the middle of the eighteenth century the hostility of the Yojuane toward the Hasinai seems to have ceased, for thereafter the two tribes frequently went together against the Apache.

The sources for the history of the San Xavier missions establish the already conjectured³⁶ identity of the Deadoses with the Agdocas of earlier times. The name is variously written Yacdocas, Yadosa, de Adozes, Doxxa, Deadoses,³⁷ etc. The same documents also make it clear that the Deadoses were a branch of the Bidai-Orcoquiza linguistic group.³⁸ On this point the anonymous document in the archives at Zacatecas, cited just above, says "Yadocxa ought to be called Deadoses. This is a band of Viday Indians who, being dismembered from its vast body, which has its movable abode between Trinidad and Sabinas Rivers, have lived for more than twenty years, for the sake of the trade afforded them by the transit of the Spaniards, on this (western) side of the River Trinidad, and, extending as far as Navasotoc, . . . are accustomed to join the Mayeyes, who reside in the thickets of the River Brassos de Dios." According to the same document, the Deadoses were habitually forty leagues east of the Mayeyes.³⁹ These statements harmonize with various other detached items of information. In 1714, for example, the Agdocas were said to be twelve leagues south of the Assinais (Hasinai), that is, in the country near the mouth of the Angelina River,⁴⁰ where Bidai continued to live to a much later date. In 1721, as has been seen, Aguayo found the Agdocas west of the Trinity, mingled with

³⁶By the present writer.

³⁷Penicaut (1714) gives the name "Aquodoces" (Margry, *Découvertes*, V, 504); Peña, 1721-1722, gives it "Agdocas" (Diario, in *Mem. de Nueva España*, XXVIII, 31); Espinosa, 1746, "Yacdocas" (*Crónica Apostólica*); Morfi (cir. 1781), "Igodosas" (*Mem. Hist. Tex.*, II, 26).

³⁸Several years ago the present writer conjectured that this might be the case. See his card notes on Texas tribes, under "Deadoses."

³⁹Anonymous Commentary.

⁴⁰Margry, *Découvertes*, V, 504.

Ranchería Grande.⁴¹ They evidently had already begun to move westward.

Bustillo bears testimony that both the Mayeyes and the Deadoses were in his day already succumbing to the principal enemy of the native American race, disease. He says: "Both of these tribes are small. I have seen them various times, the last being in 1734, when I left that province. I do not believe that they have increased since that time, because of the epidemics which they are accustomed to suffer and which they were suffering, of measles and smallpox, which are their sole destroyers." In 1745 the four bands, Ranchería Grande, Mayeyes, Yojuanes, and Deadoses, were said to comprise 1228 persons.⁴²

Other tribes intimately connected with the history of the San Xavier missions were the Bidai, of the lower Trinity River, and the Coco, a Karankawan tribe of the lower Colorado. Early Spanish contact with these tribes has been discussed by the present writer elsewhere, and will not need discussion here.⁴³

II. THE BEGINNINGS OF THE MISSIONS, 1745

1. *The petition of the four tribes.*—The establishment of missions for these tribes was due primarily to the zeal of Fray Mariano Francisco de los Dolores y Viana, missionary at the mission of San Antonio de Valero.¹ He had come to Texas in the year 1733,² and had made occasional visits to central Texas, now to recover apostates, and again in search of new tribes from which

⁴¹Peña, *op. cit.*, 31.

⁴²Memorial, May 28, 1746.

⁴³See Bolton, "The Founding of Mission Rosario" in *THE QUARTERLY*, X, 113-139; and "Spanish Activities on the Lower Trinity River," *Ibid.*, XVI, 339-377.

¹This priest signed his name Fr. María Año Franco de los Dolores y Viana, though his associates and superiors always wrote it Fray Mariano. He has frequently been referred to in *THE QUARTERLY* as Father Dolores.

²In a memorial dated Jan. 22, 1757, he said that he entered Texas in 1733, and began to journey northeast, east, and southeast. In a communication written in April, 1746, he said that he had been in Texas 13 years (*Escrito* by Fray Mariano addressed to the governor of Texas, April 16, 1746). In a letter to the viceroy written March 13, 1849, he said that he had been engaged in the work seventeen years, by implication, all the time in Texas). Father Ortiz wrote that Fray Mariano had had relations with the petitioning tribes before Bustillo y Zevallos left Texas, which was in 1734. (*Satisfacción de los Misioneros á las objeciones hechas por el Gov. Bustillos contra las fundaciones de Sn. Xavier*).

to replenish the missions, ever in need of recruits because of desertions and the ravages of disease. In the course of these expeditions he had visited the Deadoses, Yojuanes, Mayeyes, and the Ranchería Grande. The precise details of these visits, unfortunately, have not appeared. We are told, however, that with some of the tribes he had contracted friendship as early as 1734.³ Presumably the first to be dealt with were the Indians of Ranchería Grande, since, as we have seen, with these the missionaries of San Antonio had frequent and early contact. We learn, again, that in 1741, when Fray Mariano accompanied governor Wintuisen to the Trinity, he carried presents to the Deadoses and the Mayeyes and tried to induce them to enter his mission;⁴ and, again, that for some time before 1745 he had been visiting all of these tribes and they him, "either every year or nearly every year."⁵ Thus, contrary to what might be inferred from some of the documents, it is clear that a project to found missions for these four tribes was no sudden thought.

But it was not till 1745 that matters came to a head. On the second of June of that year, after numerous unfulfilled promises, it would seem, four chiefs of the tribes in question, with thirteen followers, came to San Antonio and asked for a mission, requesting that it should be in their own country, at a site which Fray Mariano should select.⁶

2. *The appeals of Fray Mariano, June-July, 1745.*—It happened that just at that time the Commissary Visitor, Fray Francisco Xavier Ortiz, was at the San Antonio missions on an official visitation. Accordingly, although he had already passed by the mission of San Antonio de Valero, on his way down the river, Fray Mariano embraced the opportunity and asked Father Ortiz to return, recommending that the desired missions should be established, with a presidio of thirty soldiers to protect the missionaries from the Indians, and the latter from their enemy, the Apache. From such a step he prophesied great results. Not only

³Ortiz, *Satisfaccion*, fol. 1.

⁴Anonymous Commentary, Arch. Coll. Guadalupe.

⁵Ortiz, *op. cit.*

⁶This is the story told by Father Mariano to Ortiz, June 13, 1745 (Copia de autos seguidos. Arch. Coll. Santa Cruz, K, 6, 17); Francisco Xavier Marquez to the viceroy, Jan. 18, 1746. *Ibid.* Note that the later documents imply that the Indians chose San Xavier at the outset.

would these Indians be brought to a knowledge of the true God, but their friends, the Texas, who had so long been obdurate, would also be converted. Moreover, great advantages would result in case of war with France, for the Indians, if converted, could be relied upon to aid the Spaniards, whereas, at present, they would be sure to join the French. To avoid unnecessary expense, he recommended that half of the garrison of Adaes be put under a captain and assigned to the proposed new presidio. To make possible the two or three missions that would be necessary for the 1228 souls which the four tribes were reported to comprise, he recommended appealing to the king for the required initial sum and a suitable annuity thereafter.⁷

Father Ortiz granted the request that he return to the mission of Valero, and, while the Indians were still there, had their petition formally examined by Thoribio de Urrutia, captain of the presidio, in the presence of the other officials.⁸ We are told that Captain Urrutia tried to persuade the Indians to settle at San Antonio, where he would provide them a separate mission, but that they refused to go so far from their relatives, their lands, their friends, and their trade with the Texas, from whom they were accustomed to procure their weapons. Next, Captain Urrutia proceeded to test their sincerity, telling them that if they entered the mission they must be subordinate to the missionaries, labor in the fields, attend religious services, receive instruction, and fight the enemies of the Spaniards. When they consented to all this he promised, in the name of the king, to aid them against all their foes, and again they repeated their request for a *padre* to go with them to their country, see their people, and instruct them as to what they must do in preparation for a mission.⁹

In addition to the appeal made to Father Ortiz, Fray Mariano addressed one¹⁰ to the guardian of his College, Fray Alonso Giraldo de Terreros, a zealous soul, who, a decade later, was to suffer martyrdom in Texas. In this appeal Father Mariano stated that, in view of the great number of Indians who would be likely

⁷Fray Mariano to Fray Ortiz, June 12, 1745. The numerical strength of the tribes was learned from the four chiefs (*Copia de autos seguidos en el superior gobierno.*).

⁸K, leg., 6, No. 5, Arch. Coll. Santa Cruz.

⁹Arrievita, *Crónica Seráfica*, 323.

¹⁰Dated, July 26.

to join the petitioning tribes, the opportunity of the College was the rarest it had ever had in Texas.

According to the reports and the names of the unknown Kingdoms which there are in all that region, making a conservative estimate, at the lowest figure there would not fail to be more than six thousand souls who in time could be reduced. It would be a pity to lose this opportunity, which would lead to another equally holy. . . . It is a fact that on one of the occasions when I went inland, I came upon Indians of whom those which we have reduced had never heard at all. And thus the report which the Indians themselves give is made to appear credible. And even if it were not, it cannot be denied that, besides those who wish to be converted, there are large nations, none of which, we know, will ever become converted unless means be taken to establish missions for them in their own country or near to them, according as there are conveniences in the different places.

Continuing, Fray Mariano suggested that Fray Diego Ximénez, secretary of the visitor and present with him at San Antonio, be sent to assist in the new work, and that the conduct of the matter before the viceroy be entrusted preferably to Father Ortiz, and if not to him, then to Father Ximénez.¹¹

Father Espinosa, in his *Crónica Apostólica*, which was completed in 1747 (though its title page bears the date 1746)¹² makes a statement which may furnish the real reason why the project of a mission for these tribes, which, as has been seen, had been known and dealt with for some time, came to a head just at the time when it did. He says that the mission of La Punta, or Lampazos, had just been secularized, and that the College wished to establish another in its place, and, therefore, promoted one on the San Xavier. As Father Espinosa was at the time chronicler of the College, just completing his now famous history, and as he took some part in the struggle for the San Xavier missions, there is good reason for accepting his explanation¹³ as at least a part of the truth. One of the opponents of the project goes so far as to say, but evidently without foundation, that he believed that

¹¹Letter of Fray Mariano to the guardian, July 26, 1745, in *Copia de autos seguidos en el superior gobierno*. For more detailed information relative to Fray Ximenes, see Ortiz, *Visita de las Misiones hecha, de orden de N. M. R. P. Conmo. Gral. Fr. Juan Fogueras, por el P. Fr. Franco. Xavier Ortiz, en el año 1745*.

¹²For proof of this see Espinosa, *Crónica Apostólica*, 467.

¹³*Ibid*

Father Ortiz's visit to San Antonio was for no other purpose than to see about establishing these San Xavier missions.¹⁴

3. *A new embassy and the selection of a site.*—While waiting for help and for approval of his project, Fray Mariano did his best to keep the petitioners favorably disposed, and to prepare the way for the establishment of the hoped-for missions. Indeed, for more than a year he and his College labored without help from the central government, and still another year before that government could be induced to authorize the mission, although for much of that time an inchoate mission settlement was in actual existence on the San Xavier.

Before the visiting Indians returned to their homes, they had promised Fray Mariano that they would assemble their people at some specified place to await his coming at the beginning of the winter. When they departed they were accompanied by an escort of mission Indians, who returned in a short time reporting that the news carried by the chiefs had been joyfully received by the people of the tribes, and that a search for a site had already been begun.¹⁵ This report was made before July 26, 1745.

Some time later, just when does not appear, the petitioners sent to San Antonio a delegation who reported that a site had been selected, and told of "many other nations" which had promised to join them in the proposed missions.¹⁶ The names of these tribes, as given in the *autos* reporting this visit—as yet the *autos* have not been found—are apparently those given later by Father Ortiz in his memorial to the king.¹⁷ His list was as follows: Vidais, Caocos, Lacopseles, Anchoses, Tups, Atais, Apapax, Acopseles, Cancepnes, Tancagues, Hiscas, Naudis, Casos, Tanico, Quisis, Anathagua, Atasacneus, Pastates, Geotes, Atiasnogues, Taguacanas, Taguayas, "and others who subsequently asked for baptism."¹⁸ Among these we recognize the Bidai, of the lower middle Trinity, who lived below the Deadoses; the Coco and the Tups, Karan-

¹⁴Anonymous Commentary, par. 3.

¹⁵Fray Mariano to the Guardian, July 26, 1745.

¹⁶Our knowledge of this second visit of the Indians comes from the Memorial of Bustillo, dated May 28, 1746.

¹⁷Memorial of Ortiz to the king, after Feb. 14, 1747.

¹⁸This list is copied in the royal *cédula* of April 16, 1748, granting the petition of Ortiz, the spelling of which I follow, instead of that of the copy of the Ortiz memorial. (*Reales Cédulas*, Vol. 68, 1748. Archivo General y Público, Mexico).

kawan tribes of the lower Colorado and the gulf coast; the Naguidis, a little known branch of the Hasinai, of eastern Texas; the Tonkawa, Kichai, Towakana, and Taovayas, tribes then all living on the upper Trinity, Brazos, and Red Rivers,¹⁹ beyond the Hierbipiames and Mayeyes; and the Tanico, a tribe near the Mississippi. The wide geographical distribution of these tribes might cause one to be suspicious of the genuineness of the report, but this doubt is lessened when we learn that later on a number of the tribes named actually became identified with the enterprise. The most that could be said in criticism of the report is that the outlook was perhaps regarded with a somewhat unwarranted optimism.

After making suitable presents to the delegation, Fray Mariano set out with them, accompanied by some mission Indians and soldiers, to visit the petitioners in their homes, and to view the site which they had selected. The place, it seems, was beyond the first or the second arm of the Brazos. The journey was impeded by high waters, and Fray Mariano was forced to turn back. But he sent forward some of the soldiers and neophytes, who succeeded in reaching a gathering of Indians, of various tribes, who were awaiting them in the Monte Grande on the Brazos.²⁰

¹⁹For the identification of some of these tribes, see the Anonymous Commentary.

²⁰The exact circumstances of the selection of the site are not quite clear. Some later statements make it appear that the San Xavier was designated at the outset, but putting all the evidence together, this does not seem to be the case. (1) In the two petitions of Fray Mariano nothing is said of the San Xavier, and it is distinctly intimated that the site was as yet unchosen, while emphasis is put upon the fact that the Indians desired a mission in their own country. This, we have seen, was characteristically beyond the Little and the Brazos rivers. (2) The story related above of Fray Mariano's unsuccessful attempt to visit the site is given by both Bustillo and the Anonymous Commentary. While the former hints that there was some disappointment in regard to water facilities in the immediate country of the Indians, it gives the floods as the reason for the change of site. The words are as follows: "Tired of crossing so much water, since the Indians were waiting in the Monte Grande, and in order that the soldiers might return, they [the Indians] showed them the Rio de San Xavier." (3) That the site was changed is definitely asserted by Fray Santa Ana, who, at the same time was president of the missions at San Antonio, but he gives as the reason the lack of water facilities in the immediate country of the Indians. In a letter written to the viceroy on June 24, 1748, he explains the increased demands by Fray Mariano for military protection at San Xavier by saying that at first the Indians had asked that the missions be in their own lands; that none of them "reside where they would be exposed to the invasions of the Apaches," and that, therefore, it was at first thought that thirty soldiers

Now, it seems, on account of the difficulties of passing the high waters, the place which had been chosen was given up, and the soldiers were conducted to the San Xavier River, instead, and shown a site there. There are indications also that one of the reasons for a change of site was the discovery by the Indians that in their immediate country the necessary water facilities were lacking. This could hardly have referred to a lack of water, but rather to a topography unsuited to irrigation.

On returning to San Antonio the soldiers reported that they had examined the site shown to them on the San Xavier and that they had found it satisfactory. Hereupon²¹ new *autos* were drawn before the captain and the cabildo, giving an account of the occurrences just related, expressing a favorable opinion of the site chosen, asserting, as a warning, that the petitioners had all come armed with French guns, and giving assurance that "through this establishment of pueblos the malice of the Apache nation will be punished and the communication of the French nation will be prevented."²²

4. *The beginnings of a tentative mission, January-April, 1746.*—Various items of rather fragmentary information enable us to record the circumstances and to establish the date of the actual beginnings of tentative missionary work at San Xavier, both of which matters have hitherto been undetermined.

True to his promise, at the coming of winter Fray Mariano went to meet the petitioners at the designated site, where we find him in January, 1746, accompanied by the alférez of the San Antonio garrison, a squad of soldiers, and some mission Indians (and, presumably, with oxen and agricultural implements), making preparations for the hoped-for missions.²³ Besides the original petitioners, he found at the site some of the Coco tribe, with

would be enough; but that when it was later learned that suitable water facilities were lacking in their country, the Indians insisted on gathering on the San Xavier, which, being a site exposed to the Apaches, required more protection (Copia de autos seguidos en el superior gobierno).

²¹Or, possibly, after Fray Mariano's first visit.

²²Bustillo, *op. cit.*, par. 1. For a summary of the *autos*, see Bustillo, and for the petition of the College based on the *autos*, see an *expediente* in the Lamar Papers entitled "Ereccion de la Mision [Presidio] de Sn. Xavier," 3, and Terreros to Mediavilla, June 23, 1746.

²³Fray Mariano tells us this in a document dated April 13, 1746. See also documents dated June 10 and 11, 1746, in Copia de Cartas del R. P. Guardn.

whom he had communicated in the previous October. They assisted in the preparations, promised to enter the missions, and returned to their native haunts for their families.²⁴ A mission site was chosen on the south side of the San Xavier River, now the San Gabriel, a short distance above its junction with the Arroyo de las Ánimas, now Brushy Creek.²⁵ Sometime before April 13, evidently, Father Mariano wrote to his president at San Antonio that, since the good intentions of the Indians had proved constant, "he had founded a mission to attract them, on the banks of the San Xavier,²⁶ in which enterprise he had spent all he possessed; that the place was most fertile, and its fields spacious and watered with good and plentiful water, that he had planted potatoes, and that though he had lost [some], he still had enough for another planting."²⁷ The mission was regarded as having been "founded," therefore, between January and April 13, 1746. Thus far, however, the founding seems to have consisted in little more than the selection of the site and the planting of crops. It had not yet been duly solemnized.

Before the middle of April, Fray Mariano returned to San Antonio, but he left some mission Indians from the latter place in charge, to plant and care for crops with which to support the prospective neophytes. When he departed he promised the assembled Indians that he would return with Spanish settlers and missionaries.²⁸

The injury to the missionary cause which the fathers frequently had to suffer at the hands of the military authorities is illustrated at this point by Father Mariano's experience with the Cocos.²⁹

²⁴See documents cited in note 23.

²⁵For the location of the site, see page 323 and map.

²⁶Fray Mariano says that "many of them lacked even the leaves of the trees to cover their shame." Communication of April 16, 1746.

²⁷Ereccion, 5, is the authority for this assertion. It is quite clear that the letter referred to must have been written during Father Mariano's first stay at the San Xavier, which ended before April 13, for he was in San Antonio thenceforward till June 11. The facts stated above are referred to in a document written near Querétaro on June 28.

²⁸Testimony concerning the Cocos, April 13, 1746.

²⁹In October, 1745, he had communicated with this tribe, who lived on the lower Colorado, through the Bidais. Just at this time Capt. Orobio Bazterra, of Bahía, was about to undertake his expedition to the lower Trinity to look for a rumored settlement of the French. The Bidais, hearing that the expedition was to be directed against the Cocos, sent a delegation to San Antonio, in the middle of October, to ask Father Mariano

As some members of this tribe were returning from San Xavier for their families, they were attacked, apparently without provocation, by Captain Orobio Bazterra, of Bahía, who was on his return from the lower Trinity, whither he had been to reconnoiter French traders.³⁰ In the course of the trouble two of the Cocos were killed and others captured. On receiving the news of the occurrence on April 13, Fathers Mariano and Santa Ana complained to Captain Urrutia, saying that they feared that the mission project would be sadly interfered with and that even an outbreak might result unless something were done, and requested that Orobio should be required at once to release the captives. Captain Urrutia issued the order and also sent to San Xavier a delegation of mission Indians to make explanations and to help keep the peace. The result seems to have been satisfactory, for later on the Cocos entered one of the missions at San Xavier, as we shall see.³¹

Between April and June, evidently, there were no missionaries at San Xavier, for early in the latter month a delegation of Indians went from there to San Antonio again to urge Father Mariano to return with the promised friars and supplies. Four days later the "principal chief of all the nations" went from another direction to San Antonio to complain of the delay in sending them missionaries. Ethnologists would like to know to what tribe the principal chief belonged, but the information does not appear. Fray Mariano took this occasion to send a new appeal for help, predicting that the Indians could not be expected to wait longer than till October before giving up in disgust.³²

to request Orobio not to harm the Cocos. He did so, and took occasion also to ask Orobio to take the Xaranames, who were living with the Cocos, back to their mission at Bahía. In order that the Cocos might not become entangled in the trouble likely to ensue, he sent to them a request that they should separate from the Xaranames. No doubt he also told them of the San Xavier mission project, for a number of them met him at San Xavier and agreed to enter the mission there. (Communication of April 16, 1746.)

³⁰See Bolton, "Spanish Activities on the Lower Trinity River," in *THE QUARTERLY*, XVI, 339-377.

³¹Docs. of April 13, 15, and 16, concerning the killing of two Cocos by Orobio.

³²Fray Mariano wrote to the guardian of his college the following account of the event and of his helplessness to carry out his heart's desire: "I would gladly refrain from further molesting your attention, for I assume that you are sufficiently occupied, but, knowing that these

Meanwhile, the crops had been cared for by the new tribes, who had remained in the vicinity in spite of Fray Mariano's absence.³³

Sometime during the summer the construction of mission buildings was begun. We learn this fact from an undated document of this year by Father Ortiz, who writes that "it appears from other letters that the said father [Mariano] has already begun a church, habitation, and other things necessary, in order that the religious may live there, and that they have planted maize, potatoes, and other grains, for which he took from his mission of San Antonio forty cargoes, yokes of oxen, Indian workmen, and others to escort him, besides the soldiers."³⁴ Before January 16, 1747, Father Mariano had spent \$2262.50 in supporting and entertaining the Indians, and by February, 1747, the sum had increased by \$5083.50.

In the spring of 1747 some of the prospective neophytes, twelve in number, were at San Antonio, probably to complain again of delay. At any rate, near the end of March Fray Mariano sent back with them some Indians from the missions of Valero and

people understand the language of hands better than that of tongues, and are more easily subdued by gifts than by words, I am compelled by my great poverty not to lose any opportunity to the end that the promptest provision may be undertaken there, and, in case delay is necessary, that assistance with the most urgent expenses may be solicited, for our lack of everything makes it impossible to send more now to the multitude of Indians which are to be reduced. This and what I noted in my former [letter] oblige me to inform you that on the fourth day of June there came to this mission of San Antonio some of the new Indians, and that on the eighth the principal chief of all the Nations came from a different direction to inform me that a multitude of people have gathered on various occasions to await me with the Fathers and Spaniards to establish missions for them, but, seeing my delay and being dissatisfied at the lack of provisions, they have again deserted. They told me that grass having grown up in the crops, the chiefs were obliged to go and assemble their tribes to clean them, aside from the fact that they are maintaining the post, not having been made cowards by fear of the Apaches, who had killed five Indians in that neighborhood, and that I should send them maize, tobacco and other *dogas* which they needed, for which purpose and the transportation of which I asked for mules. Since I was in San Xavier I have concluded that the greatest delay would be until October, for in more than eight months there would be sufficient time."

³³Urrutia, certificates of June 10, 1746, in *Copia de Cartes del R. P. Guardn.*; Fray Mariano to the guardian, June 11, 1746, *Ibid.*; Fray Benito de Santa Ana to Urrutia, April 15, 1746, in *Dos testimonios de diligencias, sobre los Yndios Cocos*; also related documents of April 13 and April 16, 1746.

³⁴Satisfaccion de los Missioneros á las objeciones hechas por el Govr. Bustillos. This must have been in 1746, for then was the time when the Bustillo fight was on.

Concepción, together with a Spaniard, named Eusebio Pruneda. Pruneda was provided with seed grain, and was instructed to plant crops and to "serve as a diversion for the people" until the viceroy should give the necessary orders for proceeding regularly. He found at San Xavier "Deadoses, Cocos, and Yojuanes." They welcomed him and turned in to help plant the crops, "the said Indians working in person"—a fact that was regarded as noteworthy. When half through with the task, however, Pruneda's enterprise was broken up by the Apaches. A band of twenty-two Cocos who had been sent out to secure buffalo meat for the assemblage met the enemy near by, fought with them, and killed one. But seeing or learning of "many rancherías" of Apaches close at hand, at Parage de las Animas (evidently on Brushy Creek) they returned to San Xavier, where the whole body of Indians remained three days prepared for battle. At the end of that time, fearing an attack by a larger force of the enemy, and "fearful of the ruin which they might wreak upon them," the Cocos withdrew to the lower Trinity, designating a place where they might be found. Before leaving they sent word by Pruneda to Father Mariano that he had deceived them by his promises to send missionaries and other Spaniards; that until these should be forthcoming they would seek their own safety by retiring; but that when they should be provided not only would they be prompt to return, but several other tribes from "*muy adentro*" (far in the interior) whom Father Mariano had not seen, would come also.³⁵

It would seem that during a part of this time Fray Mariano had with him two assisting missionaries, for later on the College of Santa Cruz asked for reimbursement for the stipend paid three missionaries for work at San Xavier during the full years of 1746 and 1747. It appears, however, that during this period missionaries were at San Xavier at most only intermittently. One of the friars who assisted Father Mariano during this time was Mariano de Anda y Altamirano, a missionary formerly of the College of Zacatecas, who had served both at the Bahía mission and at San Miguel de los Adaes. In the summer of 1747, while at San Xavier, he was ordered to hasten to Mexico to assist in securing the desired license for the missions. He passed through Saltillo

³⁵Memorial del Pe. Anda al Exmo Sor Virrey sobre Sn. Xavier.

on his way south in July,³⁶ a fact which gives us a clue to the approximate time of his departure.

We have thus been able to piece together some fragments of information concerning the circumstances of the beginnings of missionary work on the San Xavier; but practically all that we know of actual operations there between June, 1746, and February, 1748, is that the missionaries were there, from time to time at least, catechising and feeding the Indians, until the project should be definitely authorized and supported, and something permanent undertaken.

III. THE STRUGGLE FOR AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH THE MISSIONS AND FOR A PRESIDIO

1. *The approval of the college and of the fiscal obtained.*—Meanwhile affairs were taking their slow and uncertain course in Mexico. If one does not care to follow the tedious details of the persistent struggle made by Father Mariano and the College of Santa Cruz for authority from the civil government to found the desired missions, for a presidio to protect them, and for funds to support them, he will do well to pass this chapter by. But as a monument to the zeal and the dogged fighting qualities of the Franciscans, and as a study in actual government in the frontier provinces of New Spain, the struggle deserves to be faithfully and somewhat fully recorded.

On leaving San Antonio in the summer of 1745, Father Ortiz carried with him written evidence of all that had occurred there relative to the request of the tribes for missions.¹ He evidently did not reach his college at Querétaro until late in the fall, for the report of his visitation was certified by his secretary at La Punta, or Lampazos, on October 11.² The College heartily approved the plan of Father Mariano, and, as he had suggested, entrusted the

³⁶This account is based on an *escrito* presented by Father Mariano to Urrutia, telling of the event, May 4, 1747; the sworn declaration of Pruneda, of the same date; a *diligencia*, or opinion given by the cabildo, justicia, and regimiento of the villa of San Fernando, together with the officers of the presidio of San Antonio de Béxar, May 10, 1747. The story was confirmed by ten Cocos who went to San Antonio on May 7. (All in Dos peticiones del P. Fr. Mariano sobre los Yndios de Sn. Xavr. año de 1747.)

¹Arriçivita, *Crónica*, 323.

²Visita de las Misiones.

conduct of it before the viceroy to Father Ortiz, who, through his representative, Francisco Xavier Marqués, presented the two letters of Fray Mariano, and besought the viceroy's patronage for the enterprise. This was on or before January 18, and on that day the matter was referred, in the regular routine of such affairs, to the royal fiscal, Don Pedro Vedoya.³ Just a month later this official advised the viceroy to secure, before deciding so important a matter, from the governor of Texas, the officials of San Antonio, and the commissary general of missions, who was then at the College at San Fernando, "detailed information regarding the advantages and the need of increasing missions and missionaries in those places, the nations named in the two letters, the distances from the presidios of San Antonio de Valero and los Adaes, and the direction to each." On the same day the viceroy ordered that Vedoya's advice should be acted upon.⁴

Before these orders could be complied with, the College presented a new memorial based on later news from Texas and urging haste. It told of the additional tribes that had offered to enter the missions, reported that the site selected was satisfactory, and asked for the establishment, in addition to missions, of a presidio of at least fifty soldiers to withstand the warlike Apaches and to cut off their trade with the French.⁵

The matter was again sent to the fiscal, and on March 28 he, satisfied with the evidence produced and the importance of haste while the Indians were in the right frame of mind, gave his approval to the project. He proposed that for the present, until a larger number of Indians should congregate, two or three missions should be established and supplied; and that, in order to avoid additional expense for their maintenance, the garrison of Boca de Leones and the presidio of Cerralvo, in Nuevo León, should be extinguished. To provide defence for the missions and for the settlement of Spaniards who it was hoped might locate

³Viceroy's decree of this date, endorsed on the memorial of Marquez.

⁴*Dictamen fiscal*, Feb. 18, 1746, and viceroy's decree of the same date. These decrees, the letters of Fray Mariano, and the memorial of Marquez, constitute "Copia de autos seguidos en el superior gobierno."

⁵The memorial was evidently based on the new *autos* drawn at San Antonio after the second visit of the petitioning tribes and drawn with a knowledge of the decree of February 18, therefore after that date. My knowledge of the memorial comes from the summary in Erecion de la Mision de Sn. Xavier.

near them, instead of approving Fray Mariano's plan of dividing the garrison of Los Adaes he recommended transferring to San Xavier the presidio of Santa Rosa del Sacramento, of Coahuila.⁶

This proposal of Vedoya to rob Peter to pay Paul, like that of Father Mariano, was altogether characteristic. They are but single examples of a policy widely practiced by the Spanish government on the northern frontier of New Spain. The government was always "hard up," and yet was desirous of distributing funds and forces where they were most needed. Demands for protection against the Indians and for money to aid the missionaries and colonists were multitudinous. Consequently, the officials were ever under the necessity of cutting off here in order to piece out or patch on there. The truth is, therefore, that many of the new enterprises of the eighteenth century represent rather transfers of effort from one scene to another than real expansion. Actual increase in annual expenditure was in reality slight, or even tended to decrease.⁷

2. *Opposition by Bustillo y Zevallos, May, 1746.*—Vedoya's *dictamen* was referred to the *auditor de guerra*, the Marqués de Altamira. He, in turn, on April 13, recommended that an opinion on all the matters involved should be obtained from Juan Antonio Bustillo y Zevallos, at the time *alcalde ordinario* of the City of Mexico.⁸ Bustillo had been twelve years in Texas, seven of them as captain of the presidio of Loreto, or Bahía del Espíritu Santo, and three as governor of the province. As captain at Bahía he had assisted in the transfer of the Querétaran missions from eastern Texas to San Antonio. His administration as governor

⁶My knowledge of this *dictamen* is gained from the summaries contained in the memorial of Bustillo y Zevallos and Erecion de la Mision de Sn. Xavier. The former is in some respects the clearer as to the points of the *dictamen*.

⁷Thus, the founding of the mission of San Antonio de Valero in 1718, considered in one light, was but the transfer of that of San Francisco Solano from the Rio Grande to the San Antonio. The establishment of the mission on the Guadalupe above Victoria in 1736 and that on the lower San Antonio in 1749 were but two transfers of the mission of Espíritu Santo from the Gulf coast. The establishment of the missions of San Juan Capistrano, Nuestra Señora de la Purísima Concepción, and San Francisco de la Espada at San Antonio in 1731, was in reality a transfer of three missions thither from eastern Texas. Finally, the establishment of the San Sabá mission was but the transfer to another site of the missions established at San Xavier. Numerous other examples might readily be cited.

⁸Erecion de la Mision de Sn. Xavier, 5; Bustillo, Memorial, par. 3.

had been notable for the settlement of the Canary Islanders at San Antonio and for a campaign to the San Xavier and the San Sabá Rivers led by himself in 1732 against the Apaches.⁹ Altamira's advice was followed by the viceroy, who in a decree of April 18 requested Bustillo to make the desired report.¹⁰

The opposition to the San Xavier mission project offered by Bustillo in his memorial of May 28 was the focal point of much of the tedious discussion of the matter which followed.¹¹ He began by paying a generous tribute to the zeal of the missionaries of Querétaro in the northeastern provinces and reviewing the history of the San Xavier matter to date. Then he proceeded to present objections to nearly every point which had been raised. According to him, the country along the highway between San Antonio and the Trinity was occupied by only the two small tribes of the Mayeyes and the Deadoses. The Yojuanes lived far up the Trinity to the northwest, and the Ranchería Grande, now little more than a name, between the Deadoses and Yojuanes. All of these tribes were now beyond the Brazos, and by no means close to the San Xavier, while they were applying for missions merely in order to get the material benefits, "since they will never accept the principal without the accessories."¹² The Vidais might some day be reduced, but, because of their barbarity and their plentiful supply of food, he doubted very much whether their reduction could be speedily effected. The Karankawan tribes of the coast¹³ could never be subjected to mission influence, a fact which had been proved by the failure of his own efforts and those of the missionaries covering many years. He doubted the feasibility of irrigating the lands of the San Xavier, because he had camped on it three days during his campaign of 1732 without noticing any facilities for irrigating ditches. Indeed, he had reported this opinion in December, 1744, when settlement on the San Xavier

⁹For an account of this campaign see "Apache Relations in Texas, 1718-1750," by W. E. Dunn, *THE QUARTERLY*, XIV, 225-237; Bonilla, "Breve Compendio," *Ibid.*, VIII, 41-42.

¹⁰Bustillo, Memorial, par. 3.

¹¹Memorial del Govr. Bustillos en contra de la fundacion de Sr. Javier, presentado al exmo. Sor Virrey. May 28, 1746.

¹²On this point he was certainly borne out by the facts of missionary history among the wild tribes.

¹³The Carancaguases, Cocos, Cujanes, Guapites, and Cujanes.

was being contemplated. As an example of the ease with which one could be mistaken on such matters without adequate information, he said, with truth, one had only to remember the disappointment of the missionaries in 1730 when they had attempted to establish on the San Marcos the missions removed from the east.

Moreover, said Bustillo, the San Xavier River was in a dangerous location, being on the highway by which the Apaches sallied forth from their hills in the west. As to the possession of French guns by the petitioning tribes, they had not gotten them directly from the French, but from the Texas, who were the middlemen in this trade. The French themselves had never entered so far into the interior. The presidio of Los Adaes could not be reduced without great danger to the eastern frontier, and if any of the soldiers were to be taken away they might much better be stationed at Cadodachos, where the French had so long had an establishment. Adaes was the capital of the province, and should be the residence of the governors. The only reason why governors had lived at San Antonio was to avoid the hard life at the frontier post. On the other hand, the garrisons at Cerralvo, Boca de Leones, and Sacramento were all needed in their respective places, as a defence against the Tobosos and Jumanes, and besides, there was more hope of establishing a settlement of Spaniards at the last named place than there ever could be at San Xavier.

After all these objections to the San Xavier plan, however, Bustillo was ready with a substitute. The four tribes in question and the others which had been named, were, he said, nearer to "Texas"¹⁴ than to San Antonio. Why not establish a mission for some of the petitioners at the village of San Pedro de los Nabadaches, as an example to the Nabadache tribe; and another at the Aynais village called El Loco, between the Angelina and Nacogdoches? "In this way," he concluded, "three desirable ends, in my opinion, will be secured. First, that the moving of the Presidio del Sacramento may be dispensed with; second, that the Reverend Fathers may realize the fruit of their desire, and the Indians the wish which it is said they have manifested; third, and more important, that there may be restored to the poor Texas the consolation which has been taken away from them. Indeed,

¹⁴At this date the term "Texas," as a territorial designation, was still often restricted to what is now eastern Texas, then the country of the Texas, or Hasinai Indians.

I am most certain that they will receive it with notable rejoicing, for many times I have seen them lament with tears the fact that they were deserted—not that I should say for this reason that they were weeping for the lack of access to our Holy Faith, for none of the Indians with whom I have communicated give this reason, but rather those of intercourse and of trade in their products.”¹⁵

Withal, it would seem that Bustillo was a man of more than ordinarily sound sense and of candor. His experience with the barbarian Indians had taught him their most usual motives to a first profession of love for Christianity.

3. *Rebuttal by Mediavilla and the College.*—Again the matter went to the auditor. With the memorial of Bustillo was sent the news from San Antonio that the Indians had proved constant in their desires; that Fray Mariano had actually founded for them a mission and planted crops on the banks of the San Xavier; that the place was extremely fertile and well watered, and that Father Mariano had spent his all on the work.¹⁶ Hereupon, at the auditor's instance, Father Ortiz was called upon for a reply to Bustillo's objections.¹⁷

To prepare an answer, the College called into requisition a gun of like calibre, another ex-governor of Texas, indeed, Don Melchor Mediavilla y Ascona, who was then at Hacienda de Galera y Apaseo.¹⁸ Mediavilla had preceded Bustillo as governor of the province. He had been in office at the time of Rivera's inspection in 1727, had sided with the missionaries in their opposition to that official's recommendation to reduce the Texas garrisons, and had supported their appeal in 1729 to be allowed to retire from eastern Texas. It was for these actions, according to Bonilla, that he had been removed from office in 1731.¹⁹ Evidently the College expected hearty support from him, and it was not disappointed.

Fray Alonzo Giraldo de Terreros, at the time guardian of the

¹⁵Memorial, par. 19.

¹⁶Ereccion, 5.

¹⁷Ereccion, 6. The opinion of the auditor and the viceroy's decree carrying it out must have fallen between the date of Bustillo's memorial and June 23, when the opinion of Mediavilla was asked by the College.

¹⁸Bonilla, "Breve Compendio," THE QUARTERLY, VIII, 41.

¹⁹Copia de autos seguidos.

College, wrote to Mediavilla relative to the matter on June 23.²⁰ In his reply, made at his hacienda on June 28, Mediavilla was as emphatic in his advocacy of the San Xavier project as Bustillo had been in his opposition to it. He said that he knew from personal acquaintance with them that the four tribes in question were docile, and that he believed them to be "domesticable." As they lived near the San Xavier, they could easily be taken there and settled. For such a purpose this river was the best place in the province, having good water facilities and fertile lands. Bustillo, he said, could hardly be taken as an authority on this point, as he had crossed the River near the Brazos, and not near the proposed site; besides, he was rather frightened while in its vicinity on his campaign, and could not have been expected to make careful observations. As to taking the Yojuanes and other tribes in question to San Pedro and the El Loco settlement, this was impracticable, for to say nothing of other difficulties, they would be unwelcome, since they had different rites and customs from those of the Texas. On the other hand,—and the delightful inconsistency did not disturb him—it would be most easy to settle on the San Xavier not only the petitioners, but also the Texas and the Nabadache, who, as Bustillo had said with truth, greatly lamented the departure of the missionaries from their midst. But Bustillo was wrong, he said, in supposing that the Yojuanes and others did not trade directly with the French, for, as a matter of fact, they were visited regularly by traders who came by way of Cado-dachos and the Texas. Indeed, entry was so easy that in 1725 five hundred French soldiers (*genizaros*) had penetrated the country for a distance of ninety leagues, looking for a rumored mine on the Trinity, and had returned by the same route without even being molested.²¹ It was clear, therefore, if for these reasons alone, that the province needed the protection of another presidio, whereas those of Sacramento and Cerralvo were not needed where they were, and were at best serving only a temporal purpose. Well might they be taken to the San Xavier to serve so important a spiritual end.

Supported by Mediavilla's opinion and a paper of similar tenor

²⁰K, leg. 6, No. 15, Archive of the College of Santa Cruz de Querétaro, The Ereion gives the date of Mediavilla's letter as June 21, but this is evidently incorrect.

²¹The present writer does not know to what event Mediavilla alludes.

written by Fray Isidro Felix de Espinosa, who had been for several years president of the Querétaran missions of eastern Texas,²² Father Ortiz prepared his answer. It was dated at the College of San Fernando on July 30. His reliance was mainly on the opinion of Mediavilla, which he submitted with his reply. Father Ortiz himself added to the discussion little that was new.²³

Upon receipt of these opinions, the *autos* were remanded by the viceroy to the fiscal. This official was of the opinion that Bustillo was completely worsted in the argument, and, considering that he had no reason to change his original views, but, rather, strong additional ones for maintaining them, he reiterated his opinion of March 28.²⁴

4. *Delay due to the undertakings of Escandón.*—Now arose a new cause or excuse for delay. The king had a short time previously charged the viceroy with the pacification and colonization of the coast country between Tampico and Bahía del Espiritu Santo, the last portion of the Gulf coast to receive attention by the Spaniards. To effect this important task, José de Escandón, Count of Sierra Gorda, was appointed by the viceroy on September 6, 1746. To enable him to explore, preliminary to colonizing, the large stretch of country assigned to him, Escandón asked the aid of detachments from the garrisons at Adaes, Bahía, Sacramento, Monclova, Cerralvo, and Boca de Leones.²⁵ In view of these facts, the auditor de guerra gave the opinion²⁶ that with the garrisons thus occupied, none of them could be spared for the proposed San Xavier missions. He recurred, therefore, to his former opinion that neither could the presidio of Sacramento be

²²Apuntes que dio el R. P. Fr. Ysidro, undated, in *Satisfacion de los Misioneros á las objeciones*. One paper drawn by Father Ortiz seems to have been a preliminary outline of a reply and not to have been presented. The copy which I have seen contains no date, salutation, or signature, but is labeled, *Respuesta del Pe. Ortiz*.

²³Memorial del R. P. Ortiz al Exmo. Sor. Virrey exponiendo las razones para fundar en Sn. Xavier, año de 1746. The memorial is signed also by Fray Alonso Giraldo de Terreros, guardian of the college, Fray Mathias Saenz de San Antonio, prefect of missions, Espinosa, and Fray Pedro Pérez de Mesquía, all of whom had served in the missions of the northern frontier.

²⁴Ereccion, 7. The date of giving this opinion does not appear, but it was between July 30 and September 24.

²⁵See Bolton, "The Founding of Mission Rosario," in *THE QUARTERLY*, X, 118-122, for a sketch of the plans of Escandón. See also Ereccion, p. 7.

²⁶The date was September 24. See Ereccion, 12.

moved nor a new one be erected, and recommended that Father Ortiz be asked to propose some other means of securing the end so much desired.²⁷

5. *New plans proposed by Father Ortiz.*—On September 28 the auditor's opinion was sent to Father Ortiz, and on October 10 he was ready with his reply. With the courage of convictions that usually marked these frontier missionaries, he dared to question the judgment of the auditor on matters of state, insisting that the garrisons of Sacramento, Coahuila, Boca de Leones, and Cerralvo were unnecessary, and slyly affirming that they could be diverted *either* to take part in the Escandón enterprise or to protect the proposed missions at San Xavier. Since a suggestion had been asked for, he submitted two alternative plans. One was for a volunteer civil colony, the other for a presidio which should become a civil settlement after a term of years. The first plan was to use the funds now being spent in supporting the Sacramento garrison, for the maintenance of one hundred volunteer settlers at San Xavier, assigning them lands, providing them with an initial outfit, and maintaining them for a term of eight years, after which they might be expected to support themselves. This would make a garrison unnecessary. The second alternative plan was that the company at Sacramento, or another of equal strength, should be maintained at San Xavier for a term of years, with the obligation to remain thereafter as colonists, having been supplied during their period of service with the means of pursuing agriculture. In either way, he said, a substantial village or city of Spaniards would be established at the end of ten years, while the missions would meanwhile have the necessary protection. It will be seen that both of these suggestions involved the use, for the defence of San Xavier, of the funds then being spent in Sacramento, and could hardly be regarded as entirely new plans, or greatly different from that of the fiscal.

Finally, in order that the Indians now gathered at San Xavier might be kept friendly and retained at the spot, Father Ortiz

²⁷For a summary of this opinion, see Erecion, 7; for the date, see *Ibid.*, 12. It is not absolutely certain that the two opinions referred to are identical, but of this there seems little doubt. For more light on the contents, see the memorial by Ortiz, October 10, 1746, in response to the new request. The autograph copy of this document has no title, but a copy of it is labeled "Instancia, y razones representadas al exmo. Sor Virrey para la fundacion de Sn. Xavier."

requested that, while the fate of the project was being decided, a sum of money should be assigned from the royal treasury for the purchase of presents and food, for "the eagerness (*moción*) of the Indians is such that the like was never before witnessed, and . . . if this enterprise should fail . . . we do not know what would happen."²⁸

Notwithstanding the suggestion of Father Ortiz, the advice of the auditor prevailed, and, in view of the operations of Escandón,²⁹ the viceroy ordered all discussion of the matter suspended. The date of the order was apparently February 1, 1747. That Escandón's projects were the cause of the viceroy's withholding his decision is clearly stated in his dispatches of February 14 and July 27.

6. *Tentative approval by the viceroy: funds and a temporary garrison authorized.*—Nevertheless, the viceroy and the auditor were sufficiently convinced of its desirability to give the San Xavier project tentative support. On February 1, 1747,³⁰ as a result of another *escrito* from Father Ortiz, and in conformity³¹ with a recommendation of the auditor made on January 28, the viceroy ordered that the 2262½ *pesos* which had already been spent by Fray Mariano in attracting and maintaining the Indians at San Xavier should be repaid, and on February 14, in order to prevent the neophytes from deserting whilst the *Seno Mexicano* was being inspected, to protect them from the Apache, and to aid the missionaries in founding the settlement, he ordered the governor to send at once to San Xavier ten soldiers from Adaaes and twelve from Béxar.³²

²⁸Father Ortiz to the viceroy, Oct. 10, 1746, "Instancia, y razones."

²⁹The date of this order was Feb. 1, 1747. See p. 361, note 47.

³⁰The date Feb. 1, 1747, is fixed by K, leg. 6, Nos. 5 y 11, Arch. Coll. Santa Cruz; K, leg. 19, No. 67 is indefinite but corroborates the opinion.

³¹On January 16, 1747, Father Ortiz presented to the viceroy an *escrito* which he concluded by asking for the repayment to the College of the 2262 *pesos* 4 *tomines* already spent in attracting the Indians at San Xavier, and repeated his request for the assignment of a sum for a like purpose till the matter should be decided. The date of the *escrito* and its contents are gathered from the viceroy's orders of February 14, 1747, requiring soldiers sent to San Xavier.

³²Viceroy's decree of February 14, reciting the contents of the auditor's opinion of January 28 and the decree of Feb. 1. See the letter of Ortiz to the king, 1747 (after Feb. 14). Arricivita quotes an order of identical

Students should be guarded against an error at this point. An original despatch of the viceroy contained in the Lamar Papers, here designated as "Erecion," says that on December 26, 1746, the viceroy ordered the establishment of three missions on the San Xavier. From what has been stated above it will be seen that this is a mistake of the document, although it is an original.³³

7. *Father Ortiz appeals to the king, 1747.*—Perhaps in despair of success at the viceroy's court, or perhaps at the viceroy's suggestion, and to aid any effort which the latter might make, Father Ortiz now turned to the king himself. In a memorial written some time after the viceroy's decree of February 14,³⁴ he reviewed the circumstances under which the tribes had asked for a mission, gave a list of those which had subsequently joined the first four tribes in their petition, recounted the efforts that had been made in Mexico by the College, and cited the fiscal's unqualified approval and the viceroy's tentative aid recently given. With great shrewdness he made much of the political advantages of the desired missions, "even more notable because these Indians and their broad, fertile, and bounteous country are coveted by foreign nations, who anxiously try to add them to their crowns, and with this aim maintain commerce with them and supply them with guns, ammunition, and other things which they know they like." "It follows, therefore," he continued, "that if they are not heeded, and if—God forbid—France, on whose colonies they border, should become hostile, and, with the desire to gain their affections, should maintain closer friendship with said Indians, and they should become her partisans, she might without any difficulty get possession of not only this province but of many others of New Spain." But, by making the necessary provision for these Indian petitioners, New Spain would be sufficiently protected and very much increased. Not only would these tribes enter missions, he added, but the Apache, who so infested the province, and yet so many times had asked for missions, would be forced to accept the faith and attach

tenor, but gives the date as Feb., 1748. I suspect that he refers to this one of Feb. 14, 1747 (*Crónica*, 325).

³³See also the erroneous statement in *Memorias de Nueva España*, XXVIII, 179, to the effect that the mission were authorized on Feb. 14, 1747.

³⁴The decree is referred to in the memorial, and reference is made to "this year of forty-seven."

themselves to the crown of Spain. "And in this way the Province of Texas will become a most extensive and flourishing kingdom, which may freely trade and communicate with New Mexico and other provinces of New Spain and even with others of your royal crown if this communication is sought by sea." With not a little wisdom he argued, further, that by pacifying the Indians and peopling the country, many presidios would become unnecessary, and the crown thereby saved great expense.

On the basis of this argument on political grounds, to which he did not fail to add the obligation to extend the faith, Father Ortiz proceeded to request not only permission to permanently found the missions already being provisionally established, and all the means necessary for the purpose, but also asked permission and funds to establish a hospital in Texas, either at San Xavier or other convenient place, to facilitate the broad missionary project under contemplation. It should serve as an infirmary and a place of rest for sick and wornout missionaries, and be the headquarters of the prelate of the San Xavier missions, who otherwise would be three hundred or four hundred leagues from headquarters with no means of succor or medical aid. In addition to the prelate, there would be necessary two missionary priests, to act as substitutes for the missionaries, care for the military, and serve civilian Spaniards, and two lay brothers, one to serve as nurse for the sick, and the other to act as financial agent, with the title of conductor of alms, to secure funds in Mexico to help on the project.

Father Ortiz closed by repeating his request for reimbursement of the sums that had been spent by the College in maintaining three missionaries at San Xavier in the work of catechizing and otherwise preparing the Indians for mission life.³⁵

8. *Opposition to the plans for a temporary garrison.*—It was not enough for the viceroy merely to order a garrison sent to San Xavier, for excuses, or even good reasons for respectful argument, were easily found and hard to resist. And thus it was with the order of February 14. It reached San Antonio on May 7, by a courier who had been delayed on the Rio Grande two months by Apache hostilities. This circumstance, coupled with recent occurrences at San Antonio and the situation at San Xavier revealed

³⁵Memorial of Father Ortiz to the king, after Feb. 14, 1747.

by the declaration of Pruneda, made three days before, augured ill for the fulfillment of the despatch.

On the 9th Fray Mariano presented the document to Urrutia,³⁶ and asked for its fulfillment. Urrutia gave formal obedience, but wrote on Mariano's *escrito* several reasons why the detachment of the twelve soldiers should be suspended until further orders should be received from the viceroy. Apache hostilities were especially bad just then; in the preceding month the tribe had run off the horse herds of three of the missions, and were now camped near the San Xavier in large numbers; at that very moment he had in his possession a memorial of the cabildo on the subject, dated April 29, waiting till a courier could take it to Mexico; and a petition from the citizens asking him to request the aid of fifteen or twenty of the soldiers of Adaes to strengthen the defense.³⁷ To support this petition, on the next day he presented the matter to a joint meeting of the military officers, the cabildo, the justicia, and the regimiento of the villa of San Fernando, and this body issued a statement similar in tenor to that of Urrutia, adding to his reasons for suspending the order the shortage of supplies at San Xavier.³⁸ On May 19 the substance of these deliberations was embodied by Urrutia in a *consulta*, or opinion, and sent to the viceroy.³⁹

While the immediate purpose of Fray Mariano was thus frustrated, the College of Santa Cruz seized the occasion to ask not for less but for more. Fray Francisco de la Santissima Trinidad, joint agent with Marqués at Mexico for the College in promoting the San Xavier plan, put in the appeal. In a memorial to the viceroy he referred with evident approval to the reasons for not fulfilling the order of February 14. He then argued at length on the importance of controlling the group of Indians for whom the new missions were desired. They lived on the French border, secured their firearms from the French, and were in pernicious

³⁶Fray Mariano to Urrutia, in *Escrito sobre los 12 Soldados, qe avian de hir a Sn. Xavier*.

³⁷This *consulta* is summarized, also, in Memorial del R. P. (*Ibid.*) and in Presidente al Capn. de Sn. Antonio, May 7, 1748.

³⁸*Diligencias* of the cabildo, May 10, 1747, in *Dos peticiones del P. Fr. Mariano sobre los Yndios de Sn. Xavr. año de 1747*.

³⁹This fact is stated in the viceroy's despatch of July 27: "Todo lo qual me participio el citado capitan en consulta de diez, y nueve de Mayo passado de este año."

communication with the French. They were dexterous in the use of firearms, and in case of a breach with France it would be important to have them on the side of Spain. The only way to secure this allegiance was to "reduce" them to mission life; this done, they would defend the frontier against both the French and the Apache, and perhaps bring that dangerous nation to Christianity. And to do this properly would require a presidio, not of twenty-two soldiers, but of sixty or more, for which number he now asked.⁴⁰

The matter now went again through the regular routine of the viceroy's secretariat. It was first referred to the fiscal, who replied on June 28; and then to the auditor de guerra, Altamira, who gave his dictamen on July 4. Complying with Altamira's advice, on July 27 the viceroy issued new despatches. By these despatches the nine soldiers belonging to the presidio of Bahía but serving at the missions near San Antonio were to return to their post; from the presidio of Bahía thirteen soldiers were to be sent to San Xavier, and from that of Los Adaes seventeen. Each soldier sent was to be of good character and suitable for the purpose. Though the captain of Béxar was exempt from complying in form with the order of February 14, that place was to suffer a loss of the nine soldiers borrowed from Bahía. And the new order must be fulfilled without excuse or interpretation, on pain of dismissal from office and a fine of \$6000 for any failure or violation. The viceroy was now showing his teeth.⁴¹

⁴⁰He continues with a statement of the duties of such a guard, which might be interesting to quote (Memorial, en qe. insiste pidiendo la licencia para fundar en Sn. Xavier). The archive copy is undated, but it evidently fell between May 19, when Urrutia's *consulta* was written, and June 28. The despatch of July 27 refers to a prolix memorial following the consulta of Urrutia and preceding a document of June 28. "Y Sabidor de esto la parte del referido colegio insto en su pretension alegando difusamente, quanto le parcio convenir a su derecho."

⁴¹Altamira gave the opinion that if the missionaries were to ask for a hundred settlers for San Xavier he would recommend a subsidy of two hundred dollars apiece and liberal grants of land, exemptions, and privileges; but in order not to venture too freely the royal funds, and since the presidio of Sacramento was destined for other purposes, he made the recommendation which the viceroy adopted (Despatch of July 27, to the governor of Texas and the captain of Bahía). There is some doubt as to whether the date of the despatch is July 17 or July 27. My copy from the original despatch of February 24 to Governor Larios refers to the order as of July 17. But my copy of the original despatch in the archive of the College of Santa Cruz is dated July 27. In both cases the words

The missionaries were no better pleased with the new order for a temporary guard than had been the commanders in Texas with the former order. The removal of the nine soldiers from San Antonio would be a hardship to the missions; and, besides, what the missionaries demanded was a regular presidio. This feeling was made known in August by Father Mariano de Anda y Altamirano, in a memorial to the viceroy.⁴² As has already been stated, he had been assigned to the new missions on the San Xavier River; had been to the site; had been sent to Mexico to aid in securing the necessary license; and had heard of the order of July 27. His argument now was much like Father Trinidad's had been. In his memorial he prophesied that the governor of Texas and the captain at Bahía would give only formal obedience and then proceed to raise objections, with resulting delays. As for himself, he saw two difficulties. If the nine soldiers of Bahía doing duty at San Antonio were to be removed, either they must be replaced by soldiers from that presidio or the missions near San Antonio would be without protection. To take soldiers from the presidio would leave San Antonio exposed to attack. The presidio of Los Adaes, being on the French frontier and surrounded by Indians, could ill spare any of its sixty soldiers, most of whom were constantly needed to escort the governor, the missionaries, and convoys of goods from Saltillo, to cultivate the fields, or to guard the storehouse.⁴³ The presidio of Bahía was almost as much in danger from Apaches as was San Antonio; and the Cujanes were bad.

Moreover, the garrison of thirty soldiers assigned to San Xavier was altogether too small. Twelve men would be needed to guard the three missions being planned; ten to guard the horse herd; this would leave only six to escort the supply train and the missionaries, making no allowance for desertions and deaths. Finally, any guard less than fifty soldiers would be too small in case of trouble with the barbarian tribes at the new missions or of attacks by their enemies.

are spelled out in full, and I am of the opinion that the correct date is July 27 (See despatch, February 24, 1748, Lamar Papers, and Arch. Coll. Santa Cruz, K, Leg. 19, No. 71).

⁴²Memorial del Pe. Anda al Exmo. Sor Virrey sobre Sn. Xavier. I infer the date from the reference in the document to the decision of the "past month," alluding to the order of July 27, 1747.

⁴³Father Anda's paper gives an interesting statement of the duties of a presidial guard. Cf. note 40.

The provision of one hundred settlers would not serve at present, since it would take a long time to secure them, especially if the task were left entirely to the missionaries, already overburdened; besides, the allowance of two hundred pesos per family was too small, since, in spite of the greatest economy, the expense for one missionary going to Saltillo or Coahuila, with only one servant, was at least one hundred pesos.

A presidio at San Xavier, on the other hand, would be on the very frontier against the Apaches, and would help to restrain the French, who were now entering by way of the Trinity River. Indeed, it was now well known that they had a large settlement on that stream, with a garrison and fifty or sixty cannon, and were supplying the very Indians of San Xavier.

In view of all the foregoing, Father Anda closed by urging, first, that the presidio of Sacramento be moved to the San Xavier River, and, second, that thirty or forty men be added to it. If this could not be done, he urged that eighty or ninety men be detached from other presidios—not including those of Texas—and formed into a new presidio at San Xavier.

As Father Anda predicted, the disposition of the Texas commanders to comply was no better than before, though in saying this we would not wish to convey the impression that the military authorities did not have good grounds for resisting the reduction of their petty garrisons. But the resistance of the captain at Bahía, Orobio Bazterra, seems to have been in part inspired by ill feeling toward Father Mariano. The Apache situation, at least, was really serious. The captain set forth his objections in communications of November 1 and 21, and the governor, Francisco García Larios, gave his in one of December 12.⁴⁴ From a review of these documents given by the viceroy in a despatch of January 29, 1748, it appears that the objectors maintained that all of the soldiers were needed in their respective presidios; that the San Xavier, though called a river, was only an arroyo, and that their soldiers had refused to go there to live. The governor added that he feared that if he should try to carry out the order, the men would desert to Natchitoches. This argument might appear frivolous if we did not know that twenty years afterward nearly the

⁴⁴These objections are reviewed in the viceroy's despatch of Jan. 29, 1748. *loc. cit.*

whole garrison of San Agustín did that very thing. The captain concluded by saying, maliciously, it would seem, or at least without foundation, that the favorable reports given of San Xavier were false, and had probably been secured by subornation or collusion of witnesses.

Captain Orobio had a substitute plan to urge as an excuse for non-compliance, and he may have been sincere in his support of it. In 1746, as we have seen, he had gone to the lower Trinity and the San Jacinto rivers to investigate a rumor of a French settlement in that region. While there he had become acquainted with the Orcoquiza tribe and learned of the activities of French traders among them and the Attacapa.⁴⁵ He now represented to the viceroy that the "Horquisa" nation was composed of five rancherías and three hundred families; that they had asked for missions, promising to settle between the Trinidad and the Sabinas Rivers, "which is their fatherland"; and that they had repeated their offer, promising to return [to Bahía, it seems], in the following March. "He concluded by proposing various reasons for embracing and not depreciating this opportunity to reduce Indians dextrous with guns, because of their nearness to the Misippi and their communication with the French."⁴⁶

Fear that the viceroy might accept this plan, and that it would interfere with their own, sank deep into the minds of the missionaries, and they did not lose an opportunity to use their influence to defeat it, offering as their best substitute a mission for the Orcoquiza at San Xavier.

9. *Three missions authorized by the viceroy (Dec. 23, 1747).*— But these arguments of Governor Larios and Captain Orobio came too late, for on December 23, 1747, before they had been received, the viceroy, conforming with two opinions of the auditor, dated December 10 and 19, ordered three missions founded on the San Xavier River within the next eight months.⁴⁷ In consequence of

⁴⁵Bolton, "Spanish Activities on the Lower Trinity," *THE QUARTERLY*, XVI, 339-377.

⁴⁶Summary in the viceroy's despatch of Jan. 28, *op. cit.*

⁴⁷I get the contents from the summaries in Erecion, 8, and letter of Santa Ana to the viceroy, in K, leg. 6, No. 18.

The Erecion, page 8, says that on Dec. 26, 1746, in conformity with the auditor's opinions of Dec. 10 and 17, the viceroy Horcasitas authorized the three missions. This cannot have been the case. In the first place, it is in conflict with the decrees of Feb. 1 and July 27, 1747, in which the

this determination, appropriations were at once made of a year's salary in advance for six missionaries, and for the purchase by the royal factor of the necessary ornaments and supplies for the three missions.⁴⁸ Thus, after two and one-half years of petitioning and of heroic efforts at San Xavier, Fray Mariano and his college had the satisfaction of obtaining the permission and the help they had so zealously sought.

When the letters of Orobio and García Larios were received by the viceroy they were sent, in the regular way, to the fiscal, who gave them little weight, arguing especially that it would be foolish to give up a project of proved merit, like that of the San Xavier missions, for one which had not yet been investigated, like that suggested by Orobio. In consequence, the viceroy issued a dispatch on January 29, requiring the governor to carry out his former orders at once, and not to neglect that part which provided for the encouragement of as many families as possible to go to San Xavier to settle, in order that in time the garrison might be unnecessary. This despatch was enclosed in a letter of February 24.⁴⁹

By virtue of this new order the thirty soldiers were sent under the command of Lieutenant Galván, of the Béxar company. He arrived at San Xavier on or about March 13, 1748. The married soldiers were followed by their families, who remained a short time, as we shall see.⁵⁰

10. *By the king, April 16, 1748.*—Soon after the consent of the viceroy was obtained, the petition of Father Ortiz to the royal court separately bore fruit. The petition was considered in the Council of the Indies, and the resulting action shows that it struck the right chord in the royal breast. On the 16th of April, 1748,

viceroy states that he is suspending final action until the outcome of Escandón's work is known, and of Feb. 14, 1747, granting temporary aid, while the matter of approval is under consideration. In the second place, Espinosa, writing in 1747 of the San Xavier enterprise, says that "although it lacks the confirmation of the Most Excellent Viceroy" it appears to "have accepted his Catholic Zeal" (p. 467); in the third place, other contemporary documents besides the summary in "Ereccion," give the date December 23, 1747. See Fray Santa Ana to the viceroy, March 10, 1749. Dictamen fiscal, July 21, 1748, in *Memorias*, XXVIII, 73.

⁴⁸This had been done by January 23, 1748. See *dictamen* quoted in the viceroy's despatch of Jan. 20, 1748, *loc. cit.*

⁴⁹The original despatch is in the Béxar Archives, Miscellaneous, 1742-1793, and the accompanying letter in the Lamar Papers.

⁵⁰Fray Mariano tells us in a document written about May, 1749, that the soldiers were followed by their families, who remained till May, 1749.

more than four months after the viceroy had ordered the missions established, more than two years after a tentative mission had actually been begun, and two months after one of the authorized missions had been formally founded, the king issued a *cédula* to the viceroy, setting forth that, although he had not sufficient information to form a wholly satisfactory opinion, and though the viceroy had not sent the reports which he might have done, yet, "considering that the gravity of the matter does not admit of delay, and that there are in the province of Texas the nations of gentile Indians mentioned, soliciting religious in order that they may receive holy baptism and attach themselves to the body of the Church (which is the principal object which I have ordered attended to and promoted), and considering that the country, because of its great extent, unpopulated condition, and nearness to the region where the French have intruded, merits greater care and vigilance; in order to prevent them from stirring up and attaching to their side the idolatrous Indians, it has seemed proper to order and command you" to ascertain for certain that the Indians have made such a petition and that the establishment of the missions would be wise. Such being the case, the viceroy was to proceed at once to plant the requisite number of missions, furnishing the means for ornaments and other necessities usually supplied. And if the hospital asked for should prove absolutely necessary, that, too, was to be founded. Finally, the three missionaries must be paid for the time they had been serving at San Xavier.⁵¹

This situation is certainly an interesting example of the actual workings of Spanish government in the distant frontier provinces. Since the summer of 1745 the missionaries of the College of Santa Cruz had been asking for permission to establish missions at San Xavier. Meanwhile they had proceeded without this permission to found a mission—a provisional one, it is true, as early as the summer of 1746. In February, 1747, the viceroy had furnished temporary financial aid for the establishment of missions there, but for their formal erection he had withheld his consent. In December, 1747, he had given that consent, without consulting the king, it seems. In February, 1748, as will appear, one of the missions had been founded with due formality in the king's name, and now,

⁵¹Royal *cédula* dated at Buen Retiro, April 16, 1748. Arch. Gen. y Púb., Reales Cédulas, Vol. 68, No. 52.

in April, two months afterwards, comes the king's solemn order to the viceroy to found the missions if, after due investigation, they should be considered desirable.

It was apparently but another instance in which the local authorities, and especially the missionaries, took the initiative, and forced the central authorities, reluctantly, to sanction what was already done. In the Spanish as well as in the English colonies a certain measure of independence in actual governments was wrested from the central authorities by virtue of the very necessities of local initiative due to distance.⁵²

11. *Opposition at Zacatecas.*—The opinion written at the College of Zacatecas regarding the royal *cédula* of April 16, 1748, shows that the Zacatecas friars were not altogether pleased with the license permitting the sister college to enter the missionary field in central Texas. It stated that the College of Santa Cruz had four missions at San Antonio, the only ones in Texas at the time of the visit of Father Ortiz; that in the belief of the writer, Ortiz's visit had no other purpose than the founding of missions for the central Texas tribes; the country of the Mayeyes, where the mission was to be founded, was rough and bad; the Tauacana, Quichay, Tancague, and Yojuan tribes were too far to the north to be reduced at the proposed site; the Yadoxa, from whom the padres had got their information, had included them "not to secure Holy Baptism, as is supposed, but for the material benefit of clothing, tobacco, maize, and more than all this, in order that the Spaniards in a presidio may restrain the boldness of the Apache"; it would be better for the sick friars of Rio Grande and San Antonio to come to their college than to go to an hospice at San Xavier. Finally, if the Bidais wished missions they could enter that of Nacogdoches, where they went every year at harvest time and near which they lived, or to Los Ais; in either of which missions they would be near their own country. The Tawakoni, Kichai, Tonkawa, and Yojuan tribes might congregate there also and thus save the expense of new missions.

⁵²Anonymous Commentary in *Cartas del R. P. Comiso*. Fr. Manl. Sylva. College of Guadalupe de Zacatecas.

IV. THE FOUNDING OF THE MISSIONS, 1748-1749

1. *San Francisco Xavier, Feb., 1748.*—After the viceroy's consent and promise of aid for founding permanent missions were received, things for a time went favorably with Fray Mariano's cherished plan. To look after preparations in Mexico, the College of Santa Cruz appointed Fray Juan Joseph Ganzábal, who was destined four years later to suffer martyrdom at one of the missions he was helping to establish.¹ He went from San Antonio to Querétaro, arriving there at the end of March.

In February, probably as soon as he received the good news from Mexico, Fray Mariano proceeded to the formal founding of the first mission—presumably that already tentatively established—taking for the purpose from San Antonio, on his own credit, while the royal funds were forthcoming, goods of the value of \$5083.50.² The date of the formal founding is fixed by a letter written by Fray Mariano himself to Captain Urrutia on May 7, 1748, and is thus put beyond dispute.³ In the same communication Fray Mariano called the mission "Nuestra Señora de los Dolores del Rio de San Xavier." This is the earliest name I have seen applied to it, but otherwise it is always called San Francisco Xavier. Perhaps the former name is the one by which the temporary mission had gone.

The progress made at the mission is shown by the report dated March 18, by Lieutenant Juan Galván, who was sent, as has been stated, in command of the thirty soldiers who had been ordered there.⁴ Galván stated that when he arrived at San Xavier the missionaries were without a single soldier. He found already provided a strong wooden stockade, huts to live in, and supplies of seed, stock, working oxen, and clothing for the Indians. At the mission there were many Indians, of *Ranchería Grande* (*Hierbi-piame*), *Yojuane*, *Tonkawa*, *Mayeye*, *Deadoses*, *Bidai*, and *Oreo-*

¹Communication of Ganzábal, June 14, 1748, in *Memorias*, XXVIII, 70.

²Memorial of Ganzábal, *Memorias*, XXVIII, 72.

³Memorial of Fray Mariano to Urrutia, May 7, 1748. The same date is also given in Músquiz's report, based on the original baptismal records of the mission.

⁴Arriecivita, *Crónica*, 325. There are some indications that Arriecivita confused the orders of Feb. 1747 for soldiers with that of January, 1748. The order of 1747 provided for sending soldiers from San Antonio and Adaes; that of 1748 from Bahía and Adaes. Cf. Arriecivita, 325.

quiza, and others daily coming. It will be seen that most of the tribes named here were among the original petitioners. At the very moment when he was writing his report there arrived a band of Bidais, who reported that six leagues away there were more than four hundred others on the way.⁵ An Orcoquiza chief offered to bring numerous Indians of the neighboring tribes. Indeed there were more Indians than could be supported, in spite of the supplies which Fray Mariano had brought; and before the end of March he was constrained to tell the neophytes not to solicit any more tribes, to refuse food to all of those already there except such as were actually helping in the fields and at the missions, and to send word to the tribes on the way to remain at a convenient distance.⁶

In reconstructing the picture of life at the new establishment the imagination is assisted by the statement that of the twenty-eight soldiers there,—two of the thirty assigned were lacking,—one was usually employed in supervising the Indians with the stock, one assisting in the labor of the fields, six guarding the horse herd, ten guarding the missions and the families, and ten escorting the supply trains that brought maize from San Antonio for soldiers and neophytes.⁷

Galván filed with his *diligencias* a certificate that he did not regard the thirty soldiers provided sufficient for the protection of the three missions planned, but that a presidio of fifty men would be adequate. The College made Galván's report the basis of new requests, and before the end of the year Father Ganzábal, in Mexico, presented a memorial reviewing progress at San Xavier, requesting the repayment of the 5083 pesos 4 reales, and the erection of a regular presidio of fifty men.⁸

⁵Memorial del Pe. Ganzábal, pidiendo fuerzas para el resguardo de las misiones de Sn. Xavier; report by Galván, in Ganzábal's memorial (Arricivita, 325). Also in *Memorias de Nueva España*, XXVIII, 71, where I find this date. Fray Mariano states at the end of March there were at San Xavier the Rancheria Grande Indians, Yojuanes, Tancagues, and others; the Deadoses, Vidsays and other nations were at the Brazos, on the way; while the other promised tribes were gathering to come.

⁶Mariano to Urrutia, May 7, 1748. It was impossible to take from San Antonio more than 500 fanegas of maize, and by May 7 this had not all been transported (*Ibid.*).

⁷Memorial del R. P. Presidte. al capn. de Sn. Antonio, May 7, 1748.

⁸Memorial del Pe. Ganzábal, pidiendo fuerzas para el resguardo de las misiones de Sn. Xavier. See also Arricivita, *Crónica*, 325, and

2. *Apache attacks and new appeals for help.*—Shortage of provisions was not by any means the only trouble that beset the struggling mission early in its career. In April, 1748, in the midst of his pious task, Fray Mariano suffered an accident which compelled him to retire to San Antonio for several months, delayed the completion of his work, and caused it to devolve largely upon Father Santa Ana.⁹ When he withdrew he left in charge Fray Francisco Cayetano Aponte, apparently the first minister of the permanent mission (since Mariano was minister of the mission of San Antonio de Valero) and one of those who had been there temporarily, since the six provided by the viceroy did not arrive till much later, as will be seen. Scarcely had Fray Mariano reached San Antonio when bad news from San Xavier overtook him.¹⁰ On May 4 Father Aponte wrote him that two days before, more than sixty Apaches had attacked the place, ransacking the houses, and attempting to stampede the horses. The soldiers and mission Indians, of whom there were more than two hundred present, made resistance, and succeeded in driving the horses into the corral, whereupon the Apaches, seeing themselves outnumbered, withdrew, but not without threatening to come again, with a larger force, to destroy the place. This threat was understood by a Yojuan who had been a captive among the Apaches. In retiring the Apaches killed two mission Indians who were encountered returning with buffalo meat. The mission Indians, seeing their danger, now began to contemplate withdrawing to the woods for safety.¹¹

Before the end of the year three other Apache raids were made on the mission. In each the raiders ran off horses belonging to Spaniards and Indians. Incident to the four attacks three soldiers and four new converts were killed—not a great number, indeed, but manifestly large enough to cause the missionaries to fear for their personal safety and to lessen the enthusiasm of the tribes for residence at the site. The main facts of the first attack are

Mem. de Nueva España, XXVIII, 71. Galván's report is described as "7 foxas utiles."

⁹Fray Mariano to the viceroy, March 13, 1749. Santa Ana to the viceroy, March 10, 1749. The nature of the accident does not appear. After reaching San Antonio other ills beset him, almost depriving him of the use of his right arm, and extending the duration of his incapacity.

¹⁰Fray Mariano, Memorial, May 7, 1748.

¹¹*Ibid.*

told by Fray Mariano in a memorial of May 7. Subsequent events are described in a paper written by him about a year later.¹² A second report to Fray Mariano from Fray Cayetano told that on May 5 the Indians made good their threat, returned in a great multitude, and ran off the horse herd, "the settlement retaining its existence solely through divine providence."

On receiving the second notice Fray Mariano, who was still sick at San Antonio, repaired by petition¹³ to Captain Urrutia for help. Urrutia replied that he could not give it because sixteen of his men—all indeed except those actually occupied in guard duty—had gone to Bahía to escort the new governor, Pedro del Barrio, to Los Adaes.¹⁴ Urrutia forwarded the petition with his *proveído* to Governor Barrio, at Bahía, while Father Mariano waited for the expected aid. Instead of giving it, however, Barrio wrote a sharp reply to Captain Urrutia for having received and forwarded the petition, saying that the king was more in need of Urrutia's sword than of his pen.¹⁵ This attitude on the part of Governor Barrio, at the opening of his term, was quite in keeping with all of his subsequent dealings with Fray Mariano. Indeed, the hostility between these two prominent men was one of the leading threads of the history of the San Xavier mission for more than a year.

Fray Mariano was forced, under the circumstances, to make the trip to relieve Fray Cayetano with only one soldier and some mission Indians. Arriving at San Xavier he found that most of the mission Indians had fled to the woods, frightened,¹⁶ and threatening not to return till there should be adequate protection. Fray Mariano sent for them, and they were found so near by that they returned on the second day, bringing more than had run away.

¹²Communication to the governor. In it he speaks of a year having transpired since the Apache attacks. I infer that the document was written as late as May, 1749.

¹³Escrito of May 7.

¹⁴Memorial del R. P. Presidte. al Capn. de Sn. Antonio pidiendo fuerzas para la defensa del Presidio, y misiones de S. Xavier. May 7, 1748. The word "Presidio" in the title, which is an archive label, is misleading.

¹⁵Escrito presentado al Govr. Dn. Pedro del Varrio sobre Sn. Xavier, 1749. Fray Mariano later wrote that at the time he attributed this position of Barrio "not to passion but to his recent arrival, and his not having heard of a person who, *sin dablar la hoja y sin embolar los filos*, does his best to perform his duty (*Ibid.*).

¹⁶*Cf.*, letter of March 13, 1749, for these events.

After that, says Fray Mariano, they remained steadfast up to the time of his writing. We thus infer that the mission continued in operation.

Notwithstanding his sharp reply to Urrutia, Fray Mariano Barrio wrote that he would hasten to San Xavier. He did so, arriving on May 26 and remaining two days. During this time he conducted an investigation, about which we shall hear in another connection. Before leaving he ordered the soldiers to send their wives and children away, the inference being that he did so on account of danger from the Apaches. He also suggested, as a means of increasing the temporary defences, that Father Mariano bring from San Antonio fifteen or twenty mission Indians.¹⁷

Fray Mariano continued ill¹⁸ for a year or more after April, 1748, and could not carry on the work at San Xavier, but Father Santa Ana supervised it, and it seems that one or more missionaries spent a part of the time with Father Aponte.¹⁹

By March, 1749, Father Santa Ana was able to report a good beginning for the first mission. He wrote on the 10th of that month: "The mission of San Javier, having some established form, has been situated on this River since February of last year. Not counting those who have died Christians, there are listed in it of the nation of the Mayeye thirty-two men, among them being only two old men, one of sixty and the other of eighty years of age. The women number only forty-one, because this nation has been attacked by the Apaches. The youths, maidens, and children, likewise number only thirteen, for the same reason. Of the nation of the Hierbipiamos there are thirty-one men, there being no old men among them; women, twenty-one, boys and girls, eleven. This nation suffered the same assaults as the former. Of the nation of the Yojuanes twenty-six men, none of them old; women, twenty-three; boys and girls, seven; youths, twenty-eight. With these three nations there are some Tanchagues, who struggle with

¹⁷K, leg. 19, Nos. 79 and 80, Arch. Coll. Santa Cruz.

¹⁸Santa Ana wrote to the viceroy March 10, 1749, that Fray Mariano was entirely free from blame for any shortcoming at the new missions, having been since the month of April of last year gravely ill; "for which reason I was obliged, from that time, to continue with the matters pending relative to the three new missions of said river. But as soon as he is restored from his illness he will perfect and complete what he has begun." Dictamen del Auditor de guerra.

¹⁹My evidence for this is given further on.

the Apaches, whom they attacked last year before the governor of Coahuila did so."²⁰

3. *Assignment of regular missionaries.*—At the end of March, 1748, the first regular assignment of missionaries was made by the College. On the 31st of that month the newly elected guardian, Fray Francisco Xavier Castellanos, himself a former worker in Texas,²¹ wrote to the president, Father Santa Ana, in regard to his plans. The new missions had been erected into a presidency, and Fray Mariano, of course, made the president.^{21a} Six new missionaries were to be provided for Texas, but three of them were to change places with three of the "antiguos" (old missionaries) at the San Antonio missions, two from mission Valero and one other. With these three men already in Texas, three of the new ones were to go to San Xavier, the rest to be distributed elsewhere, as President Santa Ana should see fit.

The Valero missionaries at this time were Fray Mariano and Fray Diego Martín García. The latter had been in Texas since 1741, at least.²² It is to him that we owe the preservation of the earliest records of the Texas missions. Later he saw service in the missions of northern Sonora. The missionaries named in the guardian's letter were Friars Alonso Giraldo de Terreros, Juan de los Angeles, and Saluad de Amaya, all of whom had formerly served in Texas;²³ and Juan Hernández, Mariano Anda, and Fray Domingo, referring by the last name, no doubt, to Fray Juan Domingo Arriacivita, later known as the historian. The document does not state in terms that all of these men are among the missionaries to be sent, but such is the implication. It will be seen later on that some of them did and some did not operate at San Xavier. In addition to these six new missionaries, sent in the name of the three new missions, Father Castellanos promised to send others to supply deficiencies.

²⁰Dictamen del Auditor. For the attack by the governor of Coahuila, see Dunn, *Apache Relations in Texas*, 254.

²¹He had been at the mission of Valero twenty years before. See Schmidt, *Franciscan Missionaries in Texas*, 7.

^{21a}Nevertheless, the San Xavier missions continued to be administered as belonging to the presidency of San Antonio.

²²See Schmidt's list, *op. cit.*

²³Terreros had been at Valero in 1730 and 1731; Amaya was in Texas during the period 1728-1734. Schmidt, *op. cit.*; and Los Angeles in 1744. Schmidt, *op. cit.*

Of the new workers the guardian specifically assigned to stations only two. They were Fathers Terreros and Hernández, who were to take the places of the Valero ministers. Two of the appointees seem to have been considered hard to get along with. President Santa Ana was instructed to see to it that all did their full duty, and to send them back to the College for discipline if necessary. "*Hoc dico sub sigilo* with reference to the Fathers Preachers Anda and Amaya, for the others, I have no doubt, will conduct themselves well."

"With respect to Father Preacher Anda, your Reverence will see whether it is proper for him to remain in those missions or those of San Xavier, and with your accustomed prudence will decide the matter; for I desire to relieve your Reverence as much as possible of the cares which the reverend fathers presidents are caused by the lack of congeniality and agreement of the missionaries."²⁴

To aid in their work, the missionaries were to take from the missions of San Antonio, or from the Rio Grande if necessary, as many families of converted Indians as might be needed. Cattle and other supplies were also to be secured from these places, at a fair price it was hoped, and the new missions were to pay them back "when, how, and in what" was possible. Matters not specifically provided for in the instruction were to be decided by the two presidents in conference.²⁵

The missionaries were all supplied and ready to go when the above communication was written, and presumably they soon set out.²⁶

4. *The supplies delayed.*—On June 13, the new missionaries reached San Antonio, but through slowness in the despatch of the supplies, and Fray Mariano's illness, there was another half year's delay. The situation on June 24 is stated in Father Santa Ana's letter of that date to the viceroy: "I am obliged to make known to your Excellency that on the 13th of June I found myself with the religious who ought to be in the missions of San Xavier, and the simple notice that within eight months the reduction of the Indians in three missions should be effected.

²⁴Castellanos and Amaya had been in Texas about the same time.

²⁵Father Castellanos to Fray Santa Anna, March 31, 1748.

²⁶"Por hallarse ya los Ministros en vn todo hauiados, y para salir a las nuevas conversiones." Castellanos, *op. cit.*

"This appears to be a decree of December of the past year, but it is morally impossible to put it into effect until the supplies come (which will be in the month of October or November), for it is certain that among these Indians there is not a thing with which they can sustain and maintain themselves unalterably in that place, since their sustenance depends on the chase.

"And thus the entry of the religious and the supplies must be provided for, certainly with six hundred fanegas of maize for each one of the conversions, and also some cattle, sheep, and goats. All of this up to the present it has been impossible to provide, now for lack of pack mules, and the inseparable cost of freightage; now because the enemies, as I suppose the ministers of your Excellency have reported, make it impossible to travel the road without difficulty. And thus, with great humility, I will do what your Excellency orders, but only in the most opportune time and by the best means.²⁷

"In case of founding in fact the missions of San Xavier, there will be necessary an order from your Excellency to the effect that the governor of this province or another minister assist at this act with the accustomed formality, giving in your Excellency's name possession of that country to the Indians which, all being recorded by juridical *diligencias*, may be sent to the Secretaria de Gobierno, as a means by which your Excellency may be informed of the number of souls which enter each one of the conversions."²⁸

Although the documents are not explicit on this point, it seems that some of the new missionaries went to San Xavier during the course of the summer of 1748, in spite of the delay of the supplies. At any rate, we know that "padres and soldiers" lived there during the "rigor of the drought" of that summer. We have seen that

²⁷At this point the president explained why the demand for thirty soldiers had been changed to one for fifty, the reason given being the change of site from the country of the petitioners to the San Xavier.

²⁸Carta Ynforme qe. hizo a Su Exa. el Rdo. Pe. Preste. Fr. Benitto, June 24, 1748. The main contents of this communication are quoted in a letter of Santa Ana to the viceroy dated March 10, 1749. He there states: "In June of the past year there came to my hands a simple copy of the decree of your Excellency issued in December, of the year 47, and at the same time entered the religious who were to assist in the three missions of the Rio San Xavier, and without loss of time I made supplication from this decree in the following terms," quoting what has been given above.

Father Aponte was alone in May, when Father Mariano went to aid him, and that Father Mariano was sick at San Antonio on June 24. Therefore it is evident that someone went to San Xavier to aid Father Aponte after that date,³⁰ otherwise the plural, "padres," could not be used. So much, at times, are we forced to depend upon inference.

5. *The founding of Mission San Ildefonso, February, 1749.*—Because of the illness of Father Mariano, the founding of the two remaining missions fell to Father Santa Ana. As he had predicted, it was December before the supplies arrived at San Antonio. With them he proceeded to the San Xavier, reaching the place on December 27.³¹ There were now nine missionaries on the ground,³² and prospects looked bright.

The time between December 27 and February 25 Santa Ana and the missionaries spent in founding the second mission,³³ which they placed down the river, near the mouth of Brushy Creek, and which was given the name of San Ildefonso. Since adverse reports had been made with respect to the suitability of the site, Fray Santa Ana, immediately on arriving, took testimony of the soldiers and missionaries who had lived on the San Xavier during the dry season, as to the volume of water during the drought, and then proceeded to explore the river himself, up to Apache Pass. Though the soldiers and missionaries agreed that the water supply was plentiful, when Father Santa Ana came to request them to swear to the statement they refused to do so, from which he suspected that they had sworn to the contrary for their officials.³⁴

Santa Ana's statements as to what he did in respect to the dis-

³⁰Letter of Santa Ana to the viceroy, March 10, 1749.

³¹Santa Ana to the viceroy, March 10, 1749, in *Dictamen del Auditor*. "Llegando a esta pais de Sn. Javier al mismo tiempo, que los avios, y fue el dia 27 de Dizre. del año pasado."

³²This is not mere inference; Father Santa Ana states the fact. *Ibid.*, 12. He does not state that there were not more than nine.

³³"En confianza de dha. diligencia, y aver entrado en Dizre. los avios, a las Misiones de Sn. Anto. y Sn. Javier, en 27 de dho mes, no se pudieron asertar las tres conversiones tan prontas como la deseava, y mas no teniendo dia asentado asta el dia 25 de fro; en que se conocio alguna serenidad, y todo efectuo." (Report to the viceroy, March 10, 1749, in *Dictamen del Auditor de guerra*. In the same report he twice says that he was just finishing the founding of this mission on February 25 when a despatch reached him.

³⁴*Ibid.*, p. 12.

tribution of the tribes among the different missions is of highest value for the ethnology of some of the tribes and for specific information regarding mission beginnings. Following the prescribed practice, not always observed, he separated the various bands on the basis of racial and linguistic affiliation. At the mission of San Francisco Xavier he left the Mayeyes, Hierbipiames, and Yojuanes, all related to and allied with the Tanchahues (Tonkawa), a few of whom were there also. Noting that the Bidai, Deadoses, and Orcoquizas were camping together, that they spoke the same language, and were closely intermingled by marriage, he took them to a site about three-quarters of a league (he says about a league, but a later survey called it three-quarters) down the river from the San Francisco Xavier mission and founded for them that of San Ildefonso, which was nearly completed on February 25.³⁵

When he reported the result of his work on March 10, there were at the mission of San Francisco Xavier fifty-nine Mayeyes, seventy Hierbipiames, and eighty Yojuanes, a total of two hundred and thirteen persons; and at San Ildefonso there were sixty-five families, or two hundred and two persons, comprising fifty-nine Orcoquizas, eighty-eight Bidai, and fifty-five Deadoses.³⁶

The president reported that of the Tonkawa alone he might proceed to the founding of the third mission, but concluded that since they were related to and allied with the Indians of the San Xavier mission, they might be reduced there, leaving the third

³⁵"I observed that among the Indians who were at San Xavier and who wished to enter the missions there were some Horcoquisas Indians who camped among the Vidais and Deadoses; that the language of these and the Horcoquisas was the same; and finally, that many Orcoquisas women were married to the Vidais and Deadoces, and that the women of these nations [had] relations with the Horcoquisas Indians (*Indios*). Accordingly, as soon as I began the foundation of the mission of San Yldefonso, which is distant from the already founded San Xavier about a league, going down to the east, I decided that all of the souls of the three said Nations should go to said new foundation of San Yldefonso which they have done." *Ibid.*, p. 9.

³⁶"There are in it [San Ildefonso] 65 families; of the Orcoquisa nation, 21 families, which, with men, women and children comprise the number of 58 souls, including their captain, who is the oldest of all, being about 69 years old. Of the Vidais nation there are 26 families, which include 26 men, 32 women, and 30 boys and girls, making altogether 80 persons, in which are included eight old women. Of the nation of the Deadoses there are 18 families, composed of 18 men, 21 women, 16 boys and girls. In all 65 persons, and of the three nations the number of persons with which this mission was founded appears to be 199." *Ibid.*, 10.

establishment—to be located above the first—for the Cocos and their allies from the coast.

In regard to the outlook Santa Ana was hopeful. If what Orobio had said was true, the Orcoquizas alone would supply three missions; since the Cocos had mustered the former tribes, they must have been at least as numerous; while the mission of San Francisco Xavier would yield nothing to the others in point of numbers. "And thus there can be no doubt of the copious fruit which is hoped for in the three missions of the River of San Xavier, and on this score everything that the Father Preacher Fr. Mariano de los Dolores has written too the Superior tribunal is confirmed." Of the water supply there was no doubt; irrigation would be easier even than at San Antonio; and as to the fertility of the soil, it would support not only three missions but all the Indians of the whole province of Texas and as many Spaniards besides. The climate was good and the natural fruits of the country bountiful and useful. One drawback, however, was the fact that the soldiers did not have with them their families, for there were only two women at the post, which fact would have a very bad effect on the Indians. Finally, a regular presidio was needed.³⁷

6. *Desertion of the Cocos and the founding of Mission Candelaria, 1749.*—In the midst of their labors the missionaries were dismayed by the desertion of the Coco Indians to their native haunts. The reason given was the bad conduct of the garrison. They were in ill humor through bad fare and hardship, "and knowing that anything they could do to contribute to the ruin of these missions gave pleasure to their captains, they treated the Indians with excessive insolence, inflicting upon them serious and continued extortions, the supplications of the religious not being sufficient to restrain them." Under these circumstances the Cocos, who were being maintained at San Ildefonso until their mission of Candelaria should be completed, deserted early in 1749 and fled to their own country.

This was a heavy blow to the missionaries, who feared that the fact of the desertion would be used by their opponents as a weapon against them, and that the example of the Cocos would be followed by the other tribes. But Father Santa Ana did not give up in

³⁷Santa Ana to the viceroy, March 10, 1749.

defeat; on the contrary, he set out alone in pursuit of the Indians, in spite of the danger presaged by soldiers and neophytes.

After extreme fatigues Father Santa Ana managed to find the Cocos in their haunts between the Colorado and the Brazos. At the time the tribe was suffering from measles and smallpox. The friar succeeded in his mission, and it was agreed that those not yet infected should accompany him, the others following when they had recovered. He took back with him eighty-two persons, and with them as a nucleus founded the mission of Nuestra Señora de la Candelaria. The Coco chief sent three of his sons to Mission Valero to learn the Spanish language, and later they became interpreters for the missionaries.³⁸

On April 14, Fray Mariano reported from San Antonio to Father Ganzábal that he had news that the third mission had been founded of Cocos, Tusos (Tups) and other Indians. Even the Jaranames wished to enter it, he said.³⁹ On August 11 the guardian, Castellanos, wrote a long memorial to the viceroy reporting the evidence that the third mission had been established, and asking for the payment of \$5083.50 spent by Fray Mariano in 1748 before the arrival of the funds; for \$2700 for the maintenance of three missionaries at San Xavier during the whole of 1746-1747; and for the erection of the hospice. This, he said, should be established at San Antonio, and would cost about \$14,000 besides running expenses. He closed by reiterating the need of a presidio.⁴⁰

7. *Results.*—We get some very intimate details of conditions at San Xavier just after the establishment of the second and third missions through the reports of an inspection made of them in May, 1749, by General Barrio. The governor counted in mission San Ildefonso forty-six adult men, forty-eight women and thirty-one children; in mission San Francisco Xavier there were fifty men, thirty-three women, and thirty-seven children; in Candelaria, twenty-four men, twenty-five women, and twenty-two children, a total of three hundred and twenty-two persons. Besides these, some were absent with permission hunting buffalo and eating wild fruit in

³⁸I have these details from Morfi, Bk. VIII, paragraphs 30-33.

³⁹Memorial by the guardian, Fr. Francisco Xavier Castellanos, July, 1749. Presented Aug. 11, 1749.

⁴⁰K, leg. 6, Nos. 5 (y 11), Arch. Coll Santa Cruz.

the woods.⁴¹ The missionaries were still complaining that the lack of supplies was such that they had to turn away numerous Indians who would be glad to enter the missions, "for neither God, the King, nor reason permits the Indians to be congregated to be killed by hunger and made to work. Therefore we have in the missions only those whom we can support well."

At this time Fray Mariano wrote, in the course of a dispute with the governor, that "In all the missions the Indians say prayers morning and afternoon. They live congregated in pueblos, and labor in so far as their wildness permits, making their fences and clearing their corn patches. In Texas [i. e., eastern Texas] they are not congregated, much less do they say prayers. At the same time, they are in the missions without your lordship having ordered them called or the soldiers bringing them. Therefore, it is because they desire it. It is thus manifest that these missions are a fact, and that the Indians do not live like the Texas up to the present."⁴²

Some time before this the lands and the river had been inspected with a view to opening irrigating ditches. The inspection had been made by Fathers Mariano and Pedro Yzazmendi, for, as Fray Mariano wrote, "Of all those in the provinces, we alone understand [surveying] both theoretically and practically."⁴³

The garrison which had been taken there in May, 1748, was now under a *cavo* named Phelipe de Sierra, from whom Governor Barrio withheld even the right of *jurisdicción ordinario*. It was not up to its full quota of thirty men, for during much of the past year from two to four of the seventeen assigned from Los Adaes had been lacking.

In the previous May, Barrio, during his first visit, had ordered the families of the soldiers sent away, perhaps on account of the Apache hostilities. The order had been carried out, and during the whole year the soldiers had been without the comforts of family life, at which they complained, especially since it increased their labor, for, "having no one to prepare a mouthful for them, they were obliged to do it themselves, their ordinary food being maize,

⁴¹Morfi, Bk. 8, par. 56. This shows that Mission Candelaria was founded by May, 1749, and that Músquiz was wrong in his report on this point, wherein he says it was founded in July.

⁴²Escrito presentado al Govr. Dn. Pedro del Varrio sobre Sn. Xavier, 1749.

⁴³*Ibid.*

boiled and toasted.”⁴⁴ The Indians, too, Fray Mariano complained, were displeased, since they concluded that with the families there, the Spaniards would better defend the place against the Apaches, which was one of the cardinal points to be considered. Documents of a later date show that, according to the usual custom in founding new missions, Christianized Indians from San Antonio were taken to San Xavier to serve as teachers and interpreters. Among them were Sayopines, Cocos, Pajalaches, and Orejones.

The foregoing study has set forth the story of the inception of the missions in the San Gabriel valley, of the struggle for legal authority to establish and for means to support them, and of their actual beginnings, down to the middle of the year 1749. A subsequent paper will trace in like detail the struggle of the missionaries to secure Spanish settlers and a regular presidio for San Xavier; their difficulties with the soldiers and with governors Barrio and Barrios y Jáuregui; the survey of the site by Eca y Músquiz; the opening of the “acequia” and the building of the dam; the troubles due to Indian desertion and the terrible scourge of smallpox; the violent contest of the missionaries with Rábago, the commander of the new presidio, and his excommunication by Father Pinilla; the murder of Father Ganzábal and the abandonment of the San Xavier site; the removal of the garrison to the San Marcos River, the founding of a mission on the site of New Braunfels for some of the surviving neophytes, and the absorption of the San Xavier forces by the new mission enterprise on the San Sabá River.⁴⁵

⁴⁴*Ibid.*

⁴⁵A part of this story is briefly told in the following paper by Mr. Dunn.

THE APACHE MISSION ON THE SAN SABÁ RIVER; ITS FOUNDING AND FAILURE¹

WILLIAM EDWARD DUNN

I. INTRODUCTORY

Attention has often been called to the varying degrees of success which attended the efforts of Spain to convert and civilize the Indian tribes of her northern frontier in New Spain, and it is well known that the causes for the comparative failure of the mission system in Texas may be traced in large part to the obstinate nature of the savages of that province. The share of the Apache Indians in this failure, however, has not until recently been adequately recognized, and only the barest outlines of the relations between the Apaches and the Spaniards in Texas have been known. The history of such relations falls roughly into three divisions: first, a period of mutual hostility, characterized by innumerable raids on the part of the Indians and retaliation by the Spaniards, from 1689 to 1750; second, a period of ostensible friendship and alliance, culminating in the establishment of missions for the Apaches, from 1750 to 1770; third, a return to open hostility, from about 1770 to the end of the Spanish régime. In a previous paper,² the writer has attempted to throw some light upon the events of the first period. The present paper deals with the second period, and traces the history of the Apache mission on the San Sabá River from its founding to its destruction.³

II. APACHE RELATIONS BEFORE 1750

The hatred of the Apaches for the Spaniards dated from the beginning of the occupation of Texas in 1689. The first center

¹This paper was read before the Fortnightly Club of the University of Texas at the meeting of October 23, 1913.

²Apache Relations in Texas, 1718-1750," in *THE QUARTERLY*, XIV.

³This study was made under the direction of Professor H. E. Bolton at Leland Stanford, Junior, University during the session of 1911-1912. It is based almost entirely upon the transcripts of original documents in the archives of Mexico collected by Dr. Bolton. The full titles of these documents will be given in the bibliography to be published at the conclusion of the whole study.

of settlement was in eastern Texas, the region inhabited by the Tejas Indians, whom the Franciscan missionaries in Coahuila had so long hoped to reach, and the approximate scene of the luckless attempt at colonization by the French.¹ With the conversion of the Tejas uppermost in their minds, the Spaniards paid very little attention to the advisability of cultivating friendly relations with the tribes to the west. Indeed, they were so shortsighted as to aid the Tejas and their allies, the Comanches, Tonkawas, and other northern tribes, against their hereditary foes, the Apaches. It was an affront that the Apaches did not soon forget, and they lost no opportunity of revenging themselves upon the new enemy. Until San Antonio was founded in 1718, no convenient point for attack had been afforded them, but no sooner had that frontier post been established than they began the long series of outrages which was to make them a terror to the pioneer settlers and a troublesome thorn in the side of the viceregal government of New Spain.²

During this early period the policy of the Spanish government toward the Apaches was the simple one of retaliation and punishment. When it was seen that this policy only increased the fury of the Indians, conciliatory measures came to be employed through the efforts of the priests, and only when peaceful methods failed was the strong arm of military force resorted to. This new policy was inaugurated at a time when the pressure of the Comanches and their allies upon the Apaches was beginning to be most severe, and there is little doubt that it was fear of their savage enemies rather than appreciation of unaccustomed kindness that induced the Apaches to turn to the Spaniards and accept the friendship which they had so steadfastly spurned. From the conclusion of a formal treaty of peace between a number of Apache tribes and the presidial authorities at San Antonio in 1749, there can be traced the beginning of the second period, during which the wily savages endeavored to gain the protection of the Spaniards

¹D^r. Bolton has exploded the old belief that the Spanish occupation of Texas in 1689 was due solely to fear of the French, and shows that it was a natural result of the expansion of the Coahuila mission frontier. See Bolton, "The Spanish Occupation of Texas, 1519-1690," in *THE QUARTERLY*, XVI, 24-26.

²A detailed account of these outrages will be found in *THE QUARTERLY*, XIV, 203-255.

against the advancing foe by feigning a desire to enter upon mission life and become dutiful subjects of the Most Catholic King. A few Apaches began to live in the missions at San Antonio at irregular intervals, attracted no doubt by the good food supplied and the numerous presents that were distributed by the fathers.³ But on the whole, it was a huge "bluff" on the part of the Indians, and one that the viceregal authorities in Mexico did not fail to suspect. The frontier settlers and military officials likewise, as a rule, refused to believe in the sincerity of the Apaches. But the missionaries had full confidence in the promises of their savage wards, and it was their persistent efforts that finally overcame the misgivings of the secular authorities and led ultimately to the founding of the mission on the San Sabá.

III. THE GENESIS OF THE SAN SABA PLAN

The San Sabá Country.—The mountainous region north of San Antonio traversed by the Pedernales, Llano, and San Sabá Rivers had long been considered a suitable locality in which to found missions for the Apaches. It was the favorite dwelling place of these Indians, since its ruggedness afforded numerous strongholds against the hostile Northern tribes, and to its refuge the Apaches usually fled after one of their extended raids. Nowhere did they feel so secure as in their familiar haunts along the San Sabá.

The first specific proposal for the establishment of missions in this region, as far as the available sources show, was that made by Father Santa Ana, president of the San Antonio missions for many years, in 1743, when he urged that a presidio should be built in the Apache country in order to effect the conversion of that nation. Two years later he recommended the establishment of presidios on

³I have at hand a list of supplies distributed among the Apaches by the missionaries at San Antonio for the years 1749 to 1756. A glance at some of the principal items will show the compensation received by the Indians for "being good." More than 2670 *fanegas* (bushels) of maize were consumed; 133 beeves and 76 horses were eaten; 60 *fanegas* of beans; 91 strings of pepper; 7½ *cargas* and 16 *tercios* of salt; 22½ *cargas* of sugar cane; 13 *cargas* and 5 *tercios* of tobacco; 4555 *varas* of different kinds of cloth were donated; 239 hats; 642 blankets; 458 knives; 196 bridles; 17 kettles and boilers; 132 *pesos* worth of ribbons, beads, and other trinkets (*Memoria de lo que se gasto en la pacificacion de los Apaches*, 6 pp). This additional burden upon the slender resources of the missions made a separate establishment for the Apaches highly desirable.


the San Sabá, Pedernales, Salado, and Colorado Rivers, by means of which he believed that not only the Apaches but the Comanches as well would be reduced to mission life. In 1749 Father Santa Ana introduced a radical innovation in his plan by proposing that the presidio at San Antonio should be removed to the Pedernales River, or if necessary to a site further north. This proposition naturally caused a storm of protest from the citizens of San Antonio, and the idea was declared impracticable. Similar schemes were proposed by Father Mariano de los Dolores, who succeeded Santa Ana as president, a notable compromise plan being his suggestion that the Guadalupe River be utilized as a site for the proposed missions.

Further attention was directed to the San Sabá region by the establishment in 1754 of a short-lived mission for some Apache tribes a few miles south of the Rio Grande. The founder of this mission was Father Alonso Giraldo de Terreros, a man destined to become the leading figure in the San Sabá project. After a residence of less than a year, the neophytes burned the buildings and fled to their accustomed haunts. The failure of the enterprise was attributed by the priests to the reluctance of the Apaches to live so far from their own country, and it was pointed out that no permanent success could be hoped for unless missions were founded further north in the region of the San Sabá.¹


Attention had been directed to the San Sabá country, however, for other than spiritual reasons. The campaigns against the Apaches had usually led the soldiers in that direction, and they had not failed to perceive evidences of the existence of valuable mines in the hills. From an early date there was a widespread belief that gold and silver could be found there in abundant quantity. The danger from the Apaches, however, had deterred prospectors from entering the country, and little definite knowledge had been obtained.

Exploration of the Apache Country.—With both religious and material interests at stake, it is not surprising that more and more attention was directed to the Apache country, and that efforts were

¹A full account of these early plans will be found in "Missionary Activities Among the Eastern Apaches Previous to the Founding of the San Sabá Mission," in *THE QUARTERLY*, XV, 186-200.



The Apache Mission on the San Sabá River
By W. E. Dunn.



made to learn something definite concerning this much-heralded Eldorado. Between 1753 and 1755 three extensive exploring expeditions were made to the San Sabá country. The first one was a direct result of the ceaseless labors of Fathers Dolores and Santa Ana. The many documents and arguments with which they flooded the viceroy began to impress the mind of even that conservative official, and in 1753, it seems,² an order was given for the exploration of the country of the Apaches in order to ascertain whether or not there were good sites for missions as asserted by the missionaries. This first expedition was led by Lieutenant Juan Galban of the presidial company at San Antonio, and was accompanied by Father Miguel Aranda, who went in place of Father Dolores, the latter being occupied at the mission on the San Xavier.³ The Pedernales and Llano Rivers were first examined, but no suitable sites for missions were discovered, and the party continued to the San Sabá. In the vicinity of this river they found good land, water, and pasturage, and two excellent sites were located.⁴

In 1755 another expedition was undertaken by Don Bernardo de Miranda, Lieutenant-General of the province of Texas, with the primary purpose of investigating the section known as Los Almagres, where evidences of valuable ores had been most apparent. Much additional geographical knowledge was obtained from this exploration.

In the same year a third expedition was made, which was by far the most important of the three, since it was a powerful factor in the development of the San Sabá plan. It was made by Don Pedro de Rábago y Therán, commandant of the presidio on the San Xavier River. The close connection of the San Xavier mission establishment with that on the San Sabá necessitates some explanation of its condition at this time. In 1748-49, through the

²The date is uncertain. It may have been in 1754.

³Aranda to Dolores, in Arrievita, *Crónica Seráfica y Apostólica*, 358-359. A band of Apaches was encountered by the expedition, and when informed for what purpose the Spaniards were visiting their country, they expressed great joy. Gifts were distributed, a cross was fashioned, and a procession held, the savages kissing the hands of the priest and "worshipping God and his Holy Mother." (*Ibid.*)

⁴Testimony taken in support of the right of Béxar to exercise jurisdiction over San Sava, 13; Bonilla, *Breve Compendio*, 27.

efforts of Fathers Santa Ana and Dolores, three missions had been founded on the San Xavier (now San Gabriel) River, near the modern town of Rockdale, for Indians of the Tonkawan family. No presidio had been erected until 1751, and instead of proving a benefit to the missions, it had led to their ruin. The vicious conduct of the soldiers and the captain, Phelipe de Rábago y Therán, culminated in the murder of one of the priests and a native. The captain was accused of complicity in the crime, and was suspended from his command, being assigned to another presidio pending the trial of the case. His brother, Pedro de Rábago, was appointed to succeed him in the same year, 1752. The neophytes became terrified, however, and deserted the missions. From this time on, the usefulness of the missions were at an end, and the garrison was a needless expense upon the royal treasury.⁵ Wishing to retain his command, Pedro de Rábago probably saw in the Apache mission project a chance to prevent his company from being mustered out. He was therefore very friendly to the priests at San Antonio and in full sympathy with their efforts to convince the authorities of the sincerity of the Apaches. In the exploration which he made in 1755 he marked out possible sites for missions on the San Sabá, and in his report to the viceroy concerning his activities corroborated the statements of the missionaries in regard to the peaceful state of the Apaches, making the definite recommendation that missions should be established for them at the sites he had chosen.⁶

The junta general de guerra y hacienda.—Captain Rábago's report reached Mexico just when the colonial officials were most perplexed over the question of missions for the Apaches. Father Santa Ana, although ill at Querétaro, had used every influence at his command to bring about definite action, and was making his final effort.⁷ From Texas Father Dolores continued his petitions

⁵The guardian to the Eminent Prefect of the Holy Congregation of *Propaganda Fide*, April, 1759, 2-6.

⁶Arriçivita, *Crónica*, 363; Report of the transfer of San Xavier, November 1, 1756, 2; Tanto de un decreto, September 4, 1756. Whether Captain Rábago also recommended that the presidio of San Xavier should be transferred to the San Sabá is not clear from the documents at hand, but there is no doubt that such was his idea, whether he suggested it in his report or not.

⁷Tanto de lo que se presentó en los Autos de los Apaches, 4 pp. In this document Santa Ana gave a few facts concerning the San Sabá country. The site suggested for missions, he said, was about seventy

concerning both the Apache missions and the disposition of the presidio on the San Xavier.⁸ The Governor of Texas, Don Jacinto de Barrios, on the other hand, refused to recommend the establishment of missions for the Apaches. He could not forget their past treachery and did not believe they were sincere.⁹ In view of these conflicting opinions, the whole Apache *expediente* was referred to various prominent men for advice, but their reports afforded the viceroy little help in arriving at a decision. Captain Rábago's hearty support of the enterprise, however, together with the necessity of making some disposition of the useless garrison on the San Xavier, appears to have been a decisive factor, and an order was issued by the viceroy for a general council (*junta general de guerra y hacienda*) to meet in Mexico City and settle definitely the long-agitated question.¹⁰ The date set was February 27, 1756.¹¹ With matters at such a stage, a change took place in the viceregal administration, the Count of Revillagigedo being succeeded by the Marqués de las Amarillas. The new viceroy did not interfere with the plan of his predecessor, however, and ordered that the council should be held as originally provided for, on February 27.¹²

The two problems to be settled, as has been indicated, were the establishment of missions for the Apaches in the San Sabá country and the disposition of the presidio of San Xavier. In discussing these questions, it was natural that the idea should arise of combining the two. Indeed it is probable that Captain Rábago had advised that such action be taken. There were really no substantial arguments against the founding of the missions, according

leagues north-northwest of San Antonio and one hundred leagues north of the Rio Grande missions. The settlement of this region would make a straight frontier line from eastern Texas to New Mexico, and the union of the northern provinces would be a safeguard against French encroachment. The governor of Coahuila, he continued, was in favor of missions for the Apaches, and would co-operate in the enterprise. Not more than sixty Indian families, he believed, should be allowed to settle in one place, for a mission to be successful must begin with only a few neophytes, who would remain faithful and gradually attract their kinsmen (*Ibid.*).

⁸Arriçivita, *Crónica*, 359.

⁹*Ibid.*, 357-358; Tanto de lo que se presento, 1.

¹⁰Arriçivita, *Crónica*, 365-366.

¹¹Memorias de Nueva España, XXVIII, folio 151.

¹²Report of the transfer of San Xavier, November 1, 1756, 2.

to the documents that were submitted. It was admitted that a change had taken place in the conduct of the Apaches, and although such men as Governor Barrios refused to believe the change was permanent, they could not bring to bear any forcible arguments against the missions. The priests, on the other hand, were well supplied with arguments. Unless haste was made in founding the missions, and cementing the alliance with the Apaches, they said, there was danger that the French would attempt to advance their boundaries at the expense of Spain. Already French influence was paramount among the tribes of eastern Texas, and they were reported to have designs upon New Mexico. A presidio placed in the midst of the Apaches would serve as a safeguard against French encroachment, and would extend Spanish dominion far to the north.¹³ Until that region should be settled, it was pointed out, no development of the rich mines there would be possible. The recent explorations of the San Sabá country had proved the existence of suitable sites for missions, and there was no doubt that that location would meet the approval of the Apaches.¹⁴

With such arguments in favor of the missions, it is not surprising that the council decided to put an end to long procrastination. Its recommendations were as follows: The garrison of the presidio of San Xavier should be increased from fifty to one hundred men, and transferred to the San Sabá River at the site recommended by Captain Rábago; the few neophytes of the San Xavier missions who had not deserted should be distributed among the missions at San Antonio; and the missionaries who had been laboring at San Xavier should go to the San Sabá and establish three missions there under the shelter of the presidio for the conversion of the Apache tribes.¹⁵ The recommendations amounted practically to

¹³That the fear was not all on one side is shown by the protest made by Blans, the French commandant at Natchitoches, to Governor Barrios as early as 1753 against the establishment of a presidio for the Apaches. Barrios replied that since the Apaches were in the center of the province of Texas and far removed from French jurisdiction, the matter could not possibly concern him (Blans to Barrios, February 22, 1753; Barrios to Blans, May 15, 1753, in *Investigation of French Trade*, 15, 16).

¹⁴Urrutia to the viceroy, May 25, 1756, in *Memorias de Nueva España*, XXVIII, folio 151; *Investigation of French Trade*, 15-16; *Memoria de lo que se gasto en la pacificación de los Apaches*, 6 pp.

¹⁵Report of the transfer of San Xavier, November 1, 1756, 2; Tanto de un decreto, September 4, 1756.

the removal of the San Xavier missions to the San Sabá, and their diversion from the original purpose of converting the Tonkawan tribes to that of the reduction of the Apaches. Under this arrangement, the new missions would be under the control of the president of the San Antonio missions, Father Dolores, and such a determination was eminently satisfactory to that ambitious priest.

A Philanthropic Offer.—A new and remarkable proposition, however, was to divert the government from the original plan—a proposition which marks the return to the active field of Apache mission labor of Father Alonso Giraldo de Terreros, the founder of the Apache mission of San Lorenzo in Coahuila in 1754.¹⁶ That Father Terreros had not been unmindful of the welfare of his wards after his return to Querétaro is evidenced by the fact that he had interested his cousin, Don Pedro Romero de Terreros, in his mission work and had induced him to contribute to the expenses of Apache reduction. Don Pedro de Terreros was one of the richest men in Mexico. He owned valuable mines at Pachuca and Real del Monte, was the founder of the National Pawnshop of Mexico, and a great patron of charitable enterprises in general. At a time when philanthropy was quite the fashion in Mexico, it was natural that Father Terreros should bethink himself of his wealthy kinsman in his efforts to accomplish the great work that was so dear to his heart. Don Pedro de Terreros agreed to bear for a period of three years all expenses that might be incurred in founding missions for the Apaches, and at the end of that time to turn them over to the government free of cost.¹⁷ The expenses of military protection were not included. Certain conditions were imposed: The missions must be located in the country north of the Rio Grande missions in which the Apaches lived; his cousin, Fray Giraldo, must be placed in charge of them; the missionaries must be taken both from the College of Santa Cruz in Querétaro and that of San Fernando in Mexico City, the two colleges alternating in the founding of the missions.¹⁸

¹⁶See page 382.

¹⁷Bancroft states that no more than twenty missions were to be founded (*North Mexican States and Texas*, I, 626). In the documents that I have used no mention is made of such a limitation.

¹⁸Proposal of Terreros, November 2, 1756, 5-6; Tanto de un decreto, September 4, 1756, 1; Memorial del R. P. Fr. Mariano, January 22, 1757, 9-10; Reales Cédulas, Tomo 78, No. 151, September 13, 1758; Arrievita, *Crónica*, 367.

There is little wonder that this generous offer was accepted and the original plan abandoned. The new plan would enable the work to be carried out upon an unprecedented scale, and the missions instead of being a heavy burden on the strained finances of the crown would entail comparatively slight additional expense. The viceroy did not long delay in accepting the terms of the offer. On August 24, 1756, a decree was issued substituting its provisions for those that had been recommended by the council. As a reward for his "pious labors" Terreros was given the title of Count of Regla and allowed a special dispensation in a law suit in which he was concerned.¹⁹

The viceroy no doubt congratulated himself upon the prospect for the solution of a problem that had long troubled his predecessors. The extension of the royal domain and the conversion of a powerful gentile nation were certainly achievements that would win for him the approval of his royal master. But in far-away Texas the news of the offer must have been received with mingled feelings of joy and disappointment. The change of plans meant that the conversion of the Apaches was to be entrusted to other hands, and Father Dolores probably saw with chagrin the fruits of his long labor appropriated by a rival in the field.²⁰

IV. THE FOUNDING OF THE MISSION

Preliminary Provisions.—The preparations for the founding were begun with admirable promptitude. On May 18, 1756, the formal decree of the viceroy ordering the removal of the presidio of San Xavier to the San Sabá was promulgated, and eleven days later it was communicated to the officials in Texas.¹ A change in location had already taken place. In the latter part of 1755 Captain Pedro de Rábago, alleging the lack of water and pestilential conditions at the old site, had upon his own responsibility

¹⁹Memorial del R. P. Fr. Mariano, 9; Reales Cédulas, Tomo, 78, No. 151, September 13, 1758; Correspondencia de los Virreyes, Second Series, April 21, 1759, 13.

²⁰There was always much rivalry in the Texas missionary field, even between priests of the same colleges, while that between different colleges often became bitter in its intensity. Cf. Bolton, "The Founding of Mission Rosario," *THE QUARTERLY*, X, 122-126.

¹Correspondencia de los Virreyes, Second Series, 1760, No. 79.

removed the garrison from the San Xavier to the San Marcos River.² Governor Barrios was much displeased at this insubordination, and in a complaint to the viceroy asked to be informed whether Rábago was still subject to his (Barrios') orders or had been given discretionary powers of his own.³ The governor was assured that the presidio was still subject to his jurisdiction, and Rábago was severely reprimanded for his action. The move had been made, however, and the garrison was allowed to remain at the San Marcos.⁴

Captain Rábago died not long after the removal, and in his place was appointed Don Diego Ortiz de Parrilla. The new commander was a colonel of dragoons and a man of ability. He had seen service both in Europe and New Spain. For five years he had been governor of the provinces of Sonora and Sinaloa, and had had much experience in Indian warfare through his campaigns against the Apaches of the Gila country. He was thoroughly familiar with frontier conditions, and well fitted for the command of the new establishment from which so much was expected.⁵ On account of uncertainty as to whether the San Sabá country should be placed under the jurisdiction of the governor of Texas, of New Mexico, or of Coahuila, the viceroy resolved to maintain the new presidio directly under his own captaincy-general until further light should be obtained. As a result Parrilla was made practically independent of Governor Barrios, and was responsible only to the viceroy for the administration of the presidio.⁶

²Report of the transfer of San Xavier presidio, 1-2.

³Barrios to the viceroy, September 6, 1755, *Historia*, Vol. 95, 5-6.

⁴The viceroy to Barrios, February 6, 1756, *Ibid.*

⁵Testimonio de Parrilla, January 19, 1757, 7. Parrilla, like Pedro de Rábago, was appointed *ad interim*, since the case against the former commandant, Phelipe de Rábago, was still unsettled. Parrilla was left in undisturbed possession of his command, however, for more than fourteen years (the viceroy to Arriaga, July 4, 1760, in *Correspondencia de los Virreyes*, Second Series, 1760, No. 79, 2).

⁶This matter was left unsettled for many years, and occasioned frequent reports and arguments from the governors of the three provinces. In November, 1756, Governor Barrios held an investigation at Adaes in order to obtain testimony proving the claim of Texas. This claim was based upon the proximity of San Sabá to San Antonio, former campaigns to that region, and general rights of priority in discovery and exploration (Testimony taken in support of the right of Béxar to exercise jurisdiction over San Sava, 19 pp.) The question was not finally decided until 1765, when it was settled in favor of Texas (Martos to the viceroy, April 26, 1765, *Historia*, Vol. 91, 205; same to same, April 6, 1766, *Ibid.*, 212).

Parrilla's instructions, dated September 1, 1756, contained the directions to be followed in the transfer of the presidio, the building of the missions, and the assembling of the Indians.⁷ In conformity with the recommendations of the *junta general*, the garrison of the old presidio of San Xavier was to be increased to one hundred men, including officers. Twenty-two of the additional troops were to be taken from San Antonio, and the remaining twenty-seven secured by fresh recruiting.⁸ The new company was well supplied with officers, a captain, two lieutenants, two *alférezes* (standard-bearers), four sergeants and a number of corporals being provided for.⁹ The few neophytes of the San Xavier missions who had remained under the protection of the garrison were ordered to be distributed among the missions at San Antonio, and the missionaries who had been laboring there were to retire to their college.¹⁰ The ornaments, sacred vessels, and other paraphernalia of the old missions were to be removed to the San Sabá as had been intended before the Terreros proposal had been made.¹¹ Upon his arrival at San Sabá, Captain Parrilla was to make a thorough examination of the country, so that in case a better site should be found than that recommended by Captain Rábago, the missions might be located there. He was admonished to bear in mind the possibility of the extension and growth of the missions in case it should be decided to establish a *pueblo* there. The buildings should be constructed of native timber, with the usual economy, and when the plans had been decided upon they should be submitted to the viceroy for his approval.¹² The captain was cautioned to see that the missionaries were given the best of treatment and

⁷Ynstruccion, Historia, Vol. 95, 125-131.

⁸Report of transfer, November 1, 1756, 2; *Dictamen fiscal*, in Autos flos a pedimento, 92. There was naturally much opposition from the citizens of Béxar to the decrease in the presidial garrison there. Only twenty soldiers were left, ten of whom were assigned to the various missions. The pay-roll of the company, which was the most important source of revenue to the town, now amounted to only 8995 pesos. (Expediente formado sobre las variaciones, August 7, 1760, 3.)

⁹Ynstruccion, 130.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, 125; Tanto de un decreto, 1-2.

¹¹Father Dolores would not agree to this. He claimed that the property belonged to the San Antonio missions, and that Terreros should pay for all of the equipment of the new missions in accordance with his agreement (Dolores to Bernad, April 14, 1757, in Papeles pertenecientes, 1).

¹²Ynstruccion, 125-127.

protected from any persecution on the part of the soldiers. The use of the Spanish language among the neophytes was to be encouraged. Not only were the Indians to cultivate the soil, but the soldiers as well, when their military duties did not keep them otherwise occupied. Trade with other provinces was to be encouraged, and the viceroy expressed his hope that ultimately a flourishing town would be built up and the whole region developed.¹³

The Arrival of the Leaders in San Antonio.—On September 4, 1756, Father Terreros received his formal appointment as president of the new missions on the San Sabá.¹⁴ In the latter part of the year the leaders in the enterprise met in consultation at Mexico City, where plans were discussed and arrangements perfected. Father Terreros was given a free hand in the buying of supplies for the missions. In Mexico City and Querétaro large stocks of provisions, including luxuries for the priests and trinkets for the Indians, were purchased. The priests chosen were four in number: Fathers Joachin de Baños and Diego Ximenes from the College of Santa Cruz, and Fathers Joseph Santiesteban and Juan Andrés from the College of San Fernando.¹⁵ Others were to join them in Texas. Captain Parrilla secured the new recruits required, and collected his train of military supplies. With such arrangements completed as could be attended to in Mexico, the journey to Texas was begun. At Saltillo nine families of Tlascaltecan Indians were obtained to be used as instructors for the neophytes.¹⁶ In the province of Coahuila a number of Apaches were seen. They were probably on one of their customary raids to the south. Presents were given to them, and when they were shown the rich store of provisions for the new missions they promised to assemble without fail on the San Sabá.¹⁷ The missionaries arrived at San Antonio in the early part of December, 1756, and Captain Parrilla with his train came in a few days later, on the 22d.¹⁸

The Work Under Way.—Two days after his arrival Parrilla

¹³*Ibid.*, 127-129.

¹⁴Tanto de un decreto, 1-2.

¹⁵List given in Testimonio de Parrilla, 12.

¹⁶Vindicta del Rio de San Saba, 6.

¹⁷Cabello, Informe, 45.

¹⁸Vindicta del Rio de San Saba, 1; Testimonio de Parrilla, 4-5.

began his work. His first step was the removal of the garrison from the San Marcos River to San Antonio, in order that the troops might be fitted out with the necessary equipment. They were practically destitute of everything.¹⁹ Messengers were then despatched to some Apache *rancherías* not far from San Antonio to urge the Indians to visit the settlement and meet the founders of the new missions. After about ten days a number of Indians, principally of the Lipan tribe, led by two chiefs of much distinction, presented themselves at Mission Valero. They apologized for the absence of their kinsmen, the Natajés, Mescaleros, Pelones, Come Nopales, and Come Cavallos, explaining that they were too far away to come. They gave repeated assurances of their anxiety to enter missions, and expressed a desire to become subjects of the king of the Spaniards. Captain Parrilla accepted their allegiance in the name of the king of Spain, and presented the two chiefs with canes as insignia of their office of alcalde under the Spanish government. At the conclusion of the ceremonies, presents were distributed by Fathers Dolores and Terreros. The Indians were so well pleased with the treatment accorded them that they remained in the missions for three days. Upon their departure all reiterated their willingness to become Christians and promised to assemble without fail on the San Sabá when the priests were ready to begin their ministrations.²⁰

Father Dolores was very much pleased that the conduct of the Apaches bore out the statement that he had made regarding their friendliness. In order to further establish his assertion, he drew up a formal declaration concerning the matter, and asked Parrilla and Father Terreros to add their testimony in substantiation. Father Terreros expressed satisfaction at the apparent sincerity of the Indians, with a reservation, however, to the effect that he feared that they were a bit too much interested from a selfish standpoint, since all who had come to San Antonio had asked for maize, sugar-cane, tobacco, and other articles. Parrilla accommodatingly added his testimony, certifying to the peaceful and friendly

¹⁹Parrilla to the viceroy, February 18, 1757, *Historia*, Vol. 95, 134-135; *Vindicta del Rio de San Saba*, 2.

²⁰Testimonio de Parrilla, 5-7.

attitude of the Apaches, and diplomatically praising Father Dolores for his success in their pacification.²¹

Captain Parrilla was far from stating his real opinion, or he soon changed his mind most radically concerning the outlook. The more he learned of the situation, it seems, the greater became his misgivings. In a letter to the viceroy of February 18, only a short while later, he said that the Apaches were still unpacified and as barbarous and treacherous as ever. It would require much time and labor, he believed, to effect their reduction. With the experienced eye of a soldier, he realized that all would not be smooth sailing in the San Sabá mission project, and from this time on he exhibited a lack of enthusiasm and much doubt as to the successful outcome of the undertaking.²²

A Winter of Discord.—While everything was being put in readiness for the move to the San Sabá, all was not harmony and brotherly love at San Antonio. There was constant bickering between the rival factions that arose among the priests, and life must have been anything but agreeable to those concerned. On one side were Father Dolores and his sympathizers, among whom Captain Parrilla must be included. On the other were Father Terreros and Father Francisco de la Santísima Trinidad, the right-hand man of the new president, with their supporters. The origin of the ill-feeling was doubtless the jealousy and pique of Father Dolores because he himself had not been entrusted with the direction of the enterprise for which he had labored so long.²³ But the immediate cause of trouble was the opposition of Father Terreros to a long-cherished plan proposed by Father Dolores.

In the preceding June Dolores had asked permission of the Father Visitor, Francisco Xavier Ortiz, then on his regular tour of inspection, to transfer the Indians who had been removed from the San Xavier missions to a site on the Guadalupe in order to

²¹Testimonio de Parrilla, 11-12.

²²Parrilla to the viceroy, February 18, 1757, *Historia*, Vol. 95, 134-135.

²³Dolores, according to Santísima Trinidad, had the reputation of being of a domineering and contentious disposition (*Vindicta del Río de San Sabá*, 7). This accusation is supported by the controversies that had arisen in 1751 during the founding of Mission Rosario, when a bitter quarrel took place between Dolores and Father González of the mission of Espíritu Santo (See Bolton. "Founding of Mission Rosario." *THE QUARTERLY*, X, 122-126).

form the nucleus of another mission for the Tonkawan tribe that had deserted. No presidio was to be requested, since it was thought that the absence of soldiers would prevent a recurrence of the troubles at San Xavier. The necessary authorization had been given by the Father Visitor, priests were assigned, and the Indians were being held until the viceroy should signify his pleasure in the matter.²⁴ This was the state of affairs when Parrilla arrived at San Antonio. Father Dolores had at once asked his co-operation in the plan. On January 25 Parrilla accompanied Father Dolores to the site on the Guadalupe, inspected the "mission,"²⁵ and certified to the advantages of the location.²⁶ Dolores now thought that the best way to obtain the necessary supplies for the new mission was to have it included under the terms of the Terreros gift, and he petitioned Father Terreros to this effect. Father Terreros immediately refused his consent. His cousin's intention, he said, was that missions should be founded for gentiles and not for apostate converts. Besides, the site on the Guadalupe was not situated in the territory prescribed by the conditions of the gift, and could not be included within his jurisdiction. He thus put an end to Father Dolores's hope in this direction, and thereby earned the latter's further enmity.²⁷

Father Dolores now declared open war, and showed his resentment, it is said, in many spiteful ways. Two incidents are especially amusing. First, he took from Father Terreros a servant (*mozo*) who had been assigned to wait upon the priest. When reminded that such action was not brotherly, he replied that he had rather lose life and honor than permit Terreros to keep the boy. He also refused to allow the supplies for the Apache missions to remain in the storerooms of Mission Valero, and forced Terreros to find a place for them at Mission Concepción. These occurrences are related by Father Santísima Trinidad, who is very bitter in his condemnation of Dolores's actions. Captain Parrilla also came

²⁴Memorial del R. P. Fr. Mariano, 1-4.

²⁵The Indians numbered forty-one persons in all, but the statement that fifteen were old men and women and the rest children throws light upon the true nature of the "congregation." Four Spanish families were settled there, in addition to the two priests (Memorial del R. P. Fr. Mariano, 5-7).

²⁶Memorial del R. P. Fr. Mariano, 5-8.

²⁷*Ibid.*, 12-14; Vindicta del Rio de San Saba, 5.

in for his share of vituperation, and was accused of conspiring with Dolores to bring about the failure of the San Sabá project. It is very difficult to arrive at the truth of the controversy, but it is likely that there was some justification for Santísima Trinidad's attack.²⁸

Another cause of discord lay in Captain Parrilla's reluctance to proceed at once to the San Sabá River. The priests chafed under the inactivity forced upon them, and accused the captain of disobedience to the viceroy's orders. There seem to have been good reasons for the delay, however. Winter was on, and it was a very unsuitable time to begin operations in the cold, cheerless mountainous region. There was still much to do in the way of securing supplies. The cattle had to be bought and transported from the mission of Espiritu Santo near the Gulf. Parrilla saw no reason for haste, and much preferred to pass the cold season in comfort and perfect all arrangements for the founding.²⁹ The priests could not view the matter in this light, and their continual urging for the start to be made added to the disagreeable atmosphere in the little village.

Yet progress was being made in spite of the quarrels. By March 1400 head of cattle, and 700 head of sheep had been collected at San Antonio.³⁰ On account of lack of pasturage at San Antonio, Parrilla decided to remove them to the San Marcos, so for the second time the company went into camp on that river. Just why the whole mission establishment, including troops, priests, the nine families of Tlascaltecas, and most of the supplies, were also removed is hard to understand, unless it was planned to proceed in that direction to the San Sabá. Father Terreros and his fellow-priests thought it was solely for the purpose of squandering Don Pedro de Terreros's money. This statement should be accepted with reserve, however, for our only authority is the violent Santísima Trinidad.³¹

²⁸The priest embodied his accusations in a document which he called "Vindication of the San Sabá River" numbering seventeen pages. His object in writing it was stated to be to put on record the truth of the opposition to the enterprise so that it should not be concealed at some future time when there might be a desire to distort the facts.

²⁹Vindicta del Rio de San Saba, 2-3.

³⁰One hundred of the cattle belonged to Parrilla.

³¹Vindicta, 6-8.

The Removal to the San Sabá and the Founding of the Mission.—With the arrival of spring and warm weather there was no longer any reason for delay, and Captain Parrilla decided to begin the march to the San Sabá. Because he feared that the whole project was a hopeless one, he was unwilling to take the decisive step of transferring all of the supplies to the San Sabá before he had investigated the situation more thoroughly. He probably wished also to be as free as possible for rapid marching. Consequently most of the supplies were left on the San Marcos, with thirty-nine men to guard them.³² The start was made on April 9th. Instead of going north to the Colorado River, and following that stream to the San Sabá, which would have been the shortest route, the expedition returned to San Antonio, and took up the march from there. This roundabout course was taken, according to Santísima Trinidad, because of Parrilla's ever-present desire to cause as much expense as possible,³³ but it seems more reasonable to conclude that the San Antonio route was chosen because it was better known to the Spaniards than the one up the Colorado. No details of the journey are at hand. The party probably followed the path taken by previous expeditions, striking into the hill country directly north of San Antonio, past the Pedernales and Llano Rivers, in a general northwesterly direction. Nine days were consumed in the trip, and the San Sabá River was reached on April 18th,³⁴ near the present town of Menard.

Following his instructions, Parrilla first made a thorough exploration of the river valley to its source. The sites recommended by Galban and Rábago³⁵ were examined, and on the 23rd a council was held to discuss the situation. Parrilla strongly opposed the establishment of the missions. He believed the undertaking was a chimerical one, and wished to postpone the founding. Not an Indian had been seen. In spite of this the priests believed that the Indians would soon assemble, and were firm in their determination to begin operations at once. If Parrilla did not consent, they threatened to return to Mexico and wash their hands of the

³²Arriçivita, *Crónica*, 368.

³³Vindicta, 9.

³⁴*Ibid.*

³⁵See pages 383-384.

whole affair. The captain was thus forced to yield against his better judgment, and preparations were made for the erection of the necessary buildings.³⁶

Plans were made for two missions, one to be in charge of the Querétaran priests and the other in charge of those from the College of San Fernando. The missions were to be located south of the river, some distance from the ford, while the presidio was to be placed on the north bank. A distance of two or three miles intervened, because it was thought advisable to separate the two establishments in order to avoid any evil consequences that might arise from the close association of the soldiers with the mission converts. Work at once began on the Querétaran mission, but it was decided to postpone the erection of the other one until need for it arose. It was never built. The usual plan of mission settlement was followed. Quarters for the priests, storerooms for the supplies, a rude church, and stables were erected. Around them a strong stockade was built, entered through a large gate secured by bars. Toward the river, plots of land were laid out, and crops planted. While Father Terreros was busy directing the work on the missions, Captain Parrilla was superintending the construction of the fort on the north side of the river. In honor of the viceroy the presidio was named San Luis de las Amarillas, but it was usually known as the presidio of San Sabá.³⁷ In accordance with the viceroy's instructions, the soldiers were assigned land to cultivate, and the soil was prepared for the sowing of grain. By May 4 most of these activities were well under way, and Captain Parrilla now ordered the removal of the rest of the supplies from the camp on the San Marcos. They arrived in the latter part of June.³⁸

The Fickleness of the Apaches.—The mission establishment was ready to begin operations, except for the fact that there were no

³⁶Vindicta, 9-10.

³⁷The correct Spanish form of this saint's name is San Sabás, but the "s" was very seldom added. The accent, of course, is upon the second syllable, and the pronunciation should *not* be "San Sába." Cf. the faulty pronunciation of "Anáhuac" as "Anahuac." The ruins of the presidio, as is well known, may still be seen near Menard, Texas. They are not the ruins of the original building, however, but of a later stone structure. For a description of the site in 1847, see THE QUARTERLY, V, 137-142.

³⁸Vindicta, 9-10; Arricivita, *Crónica*, 368-369.

Apaches present. Since they did not appear of their own accord, it was resolved to seek them out. Father Varela, who had long been stationed at San Antonio and was familiar with the language of the Apaches, was assigned the task of inducing them to "congregate." He set out early in May in the direction of the San Marcos, where the camp was still located. It was the season for buffalo hunting, and he probably hoped to encounter the Indians while they were assembled for the hunt. But he failed to find any trace of Apaches, and after a fruitless search, arrived at the San Marcos. Here he got his first news of the missing Indians. A few days before, a squaw had reached the camp, reporting that her tribe had been attacked on the Colorado River by the Tejas Indians, among whom were four apostates from the San Antonio missions.³⁹

In the meantime, the Lipan chief, El Chico or Chiquito, had visited Mission Valero. Father Dolores upbraided him for his failure to keep his promise, and ordered him to go to the San Sabá at once. The chief solemnly promised to obey.⁴⁰ Messengers were sent to search the neighboring country, and notify the different chiefs of a great assembly to be held on the San Sabá. The Lipans were beginning to arrive from the south, and by the middle of June about 3000 savages were encamped in the vicinity of the missions. They carried a large number of horses and mules with them, stolen no doubt from the settlements in Coahuila and along the Rio Grande. The Indians were very haughty and indifferent in their demeanor, and had it not been for the diplomacy of the fathers and the gifts that were distributed there might well have ensued a bloody conflict instead of a love feast between friends and allies.⁴¹ The missionaries were very hopeful, however, and believed that the time for the formal reduction had finally arrived. But they were again to be disappointed. Upon making definite proposals to the Indians to enter the missions at once, the real nature of the gathering was revealed. The Indians had not assembled in order to enter the missions, but were merely on their annual buffalo hunt and ready for a campaign against their perpetual enemies, the northern tribes. Chief El Chico pretended to be

³⁹Arrievita, *Crónica*, 369.

⁴⁰*Ibid.*, 370.

⁴¹Fathers Baños and Ximenes to the guardian, June 17, 1757, 1-2.

willing to enter the missions, and a few other chiefs sided with him, but the majority supported Chief Casablanca, who was bent upon making a campaign against the Comanches and Tejas and avenging the recent attack upon the *ranchería* on the Colorado.⁴² It was the same old story again. Although, the Indians declared, they wished to become Christians, they could not do so just yet. They wished to be the friends of Spaniards, however, and asked that some of the soldiers be allowed to accompany them on the buffalo hunt. As soon as they returned, they promised to accept the religion of the Spaniards and settle down at the missions.⁴³ No further satisfaction could be secured from them, and they departed on the hunt, leaving a very disconsolate group of missionaries to mourn their fickleness and a presidial commander to congratulate himself upon the accuracy of his predictions.⁴⁴

A New Scheme Proposed.—Captain Parrilla sent in a report to the viceroy a few days later, on June 30, in which he told of recent developments and repeated his disbelief in the sincerity of the Apaches. He said: "From the *autos* (official documents) which I transmit upon this occasion and from the *consulta* which accompanies them, Your Excellency will understand what a difficult undertaking is the formation of missions for the heathen Apache nation, and will see that the favorable reports that were sent in to that Captaincy General concerning the matter were direct results of the unreliability (*lijereza*) that has always characterized the missionaries and inhabitants of the province of Texas in every occurrence that has concerned them. This is proven by the history of the presidio and missions of San Xavier de Gigedo and of many others."⁴⁵

Parrilla did not for a moment believe that the Indians would keep their last promise, and thought that the mission plans should be abandoned. He now proposed a counter plan to the central authorities. He asked to be permitted to remove the presidio to the Chanas (Llano) River with its full garrison of one hundred men, in order to afford protection for the mines at Los Almagres.

⁴²Arrievita, *Crónica*, 370.

⁴³Baños and Ximenes to the guardian, June 17, 1757, 3; the guardian to the Eminent Prefect, April, 1759, 5.

⁴⁴Baños and Ximenes to the guardian, 5-6.

⁴⁵Parrilla to the viceroy, June 30, 1757, *Historia*, Vol. 95, 146.

There would still be an opportunity for the missionaries to continue their work among the Apaches, if they so desired, but the development of such remote mines in a country inhabited by barbarous savages would be in itself, he believed, a great credit to the viceroy and of much benefit to the royal treasury.⁴⁶ The Marqués de las Amarillas, however, was not ready to abandon the San Sabá enterprise, and he refused his consent to Parrilla's scheme, admonishing him to devote all of his energies to the original plan.⁴⁷ There was nothing to do, then, but to make the best of the situation and wait patiently for the return of the Indians.

The Departure of Three Priests.—Father Terreros was the only one of the priests who had any confidence in the ultimate success of the mission. Several of his companions wished to return at once to Mexico, but were persuaded to remain a little longer. Early in July it seemed as if Father Terreros's faith was to be rewarded. Chief El Chico appeared one day at the mission, his people loaded down with buffalo meat. The usual presents were given, and again prospects seem promising. The fathers were soon undeceived. The Indians refused to listen to arguments, but after a short stay speedily continued their journey toward the south as if impelled by some unseen danger. This was practically the death knell to the hopes of the missionaries, and several of the priests prepared for their departure.⁴⁸

The first to leave was Father Varela. He had long since lost faith in the Apaches, and had repeatedly asked permission to return to Querétaro. He was now given the desired license, entrusted with despatches to the authorities, and thus the first deserter shook the dust of San Sabá from his feet and returned to civilization.⁴⁹ Had Fathers Baños and Ximenes followed the promptings of their own desires, Father Varela would not have gone alone. But since they had been appointed by the *Discretorio* of the College of Santa Cruz, they must secure permission to leave from the guardian at Querétaro himself. In a letter of July 5

⁴⁶*Ibid.*, 147.

⁴⁷The viceroy to Parrilla, September 30, 1757, *Ibid.*, 140.

⁴⁸Baños and Ximenes to the guardian, July 5, 1757, 1; the viceroy to Terreros, September 30, 1757, *Historia*, Vol. 95, 144.

⁴⁹Terreros to the guardian, July 3, 1757, 1.

they asked for such permission, promising to await its arrival unless events should force them to leave before it came. Their attitude toward the mission is shown by the following extract from their letter:

The only motive that could detain us here is the administration of the presidio, for there is no hope whatever of the Indians. Neither is there any obligation on our part to serve the presidio, since we were deceived in coming, Father Terreros assuring us that the viceroy has asked the College to assign us to that administration. The falsity of this statement we clearly proved in San Antonio, for nowhere does there appear nor is mention made of such a thing. And since the said Father is indispensable to the undertaking in which he has embarked, as administrator of the property of Don Pedro transported by him for the foundation of the missions; and since at present there is no priest or son of that Holy College (Querétaro) to administer, and, in addition, since it seems fitting that some priest of the Apostolic College of San Fernando shall assist him lest there be presumed some intended plot against it on our part, it seems to us a wise thing that the said Father and priest of San Fernando shall remain alone to administer, awaiting as well the determination of the superior government.

The Apaches, they said, wanted a "workless" mission, if any at all. Even if "Don Pedro" should supply everything for three years, who could answer for the consequences at the end of that time? "Therefore," they continued, "we find no reason why we should remain with this enterprise, which we consider ill-conceived and without foundation from the beginning. . . . Having fully learned the wishes of the Indians, we find no other motive (for friendship) than the hope of receiving gifts."⁵⁰ This letter throws a great deal of light upon the situation. It is to be observed, too, that the factions that had been formed at San Antonio had continued to exist after the removal to the San Sabá. Some time during the autumn the desired permission was secured, and Baños and Ximenes left behind the scene of their fruitless labors. There were now left in the mission Fathers Terreros, Santiesteban, and Santísima Trinidad.

Disquieting Rumors.—Father Terreros seems to have accepted the situation in a philosophic way, and had no thought but to

⁵⁰Baños and Ximenes to the guardian, July 5, 1757, 1-3.

remain on the San Sabá until he should be ordered to retire. He reported the disappointing conduct of the Apaches to Don Pedro de Terreros, in order that the philanthropist might be better able to discuss the situation with the viceroy, and decide whether the undertaking should be continued. To the guardian at Querétaro the Father President, with true apostolic fortitude, said: "Be consoled, for however ill it may go with us, there will come to light a matter of much importance, and the cause of public welfare at least will be promoted." Although Captain Parrilla in the past had not always been in accord with his plans, Terreros had only praise for him. "I doubt," he said, "that America has two heads like his for matters of this nature. He is a gentleman and in all harmony with us."⁵¹

In spite of the gloomy reports, Don Pedro de Terreros was not discouraged, and after several conferences with the viceroy, expressed his desire that the work among the Apaches should go on. In a letter of September 30th, Father Terreros was informed of this decision.⁵²

It took no little courage to remain at the post in the wilderness. There was an ominous feeling of unrest in the air. From time to time small bands of Apaches stopped by for a few days to partake of the hospitality of the *padres*, but they always refused to linger in the vicinity. Their reluctance was due to the fact that the Comanches and their allies were reported to be on the war path. The Apache spies brought in tales of a great host of *Norteños* (Northern Indians) who were headed in the direction of the San Sabá, bent upon settling old scores. These reports explain the refusal of the Apaches to remain in the neighborhood of the missions. So tremendous was the invading host reported to be that they were unwilling even to trust to the protection of the Spanish soldiery, and hurriedly fled to the country south of the Rio Grande, to the fear and consternation of the isolated settlers of that region.⁵³

There seems, however, to have been no immediate cause for alarm. As the winter months passed by in monotonous succession, no sign of the Comanches was seen. Reports still came that they

⁵¹Terreros to the guardian, July 3, 1757, 1-2.

⁵²Historia, Vol. 95, 144.

⁵³Arriacivita, *Crónica*, 376.

were preparing for a descent upon the Apache country, but these rumors soon ceased to cause excitement. Life at the frontier post went on in the usual channel. The three priests continued to live in their isolated quarters on the south side of the river, attended by their Indian servants and a guard of five soldiers. An occasional visit from straggling Apache bands was the only thing to break the dull monotony. In the early part of January Fray Miguel Molina arrived from the College of San Fernando, but the missionaries were again reduced to three on January 12, when Santísima Trinidad was sent to Mexico bearing letters and dispatches.⁵⁴

On the other side of the river the current of life ran equally smooth, but social life must have been more active. There were probably some three or four hundred persons at the presidio, two hundred and thirty-seven of these being women and children. The guarding of the cattle and horses, the securing of firewood, the changing of the watch, the occasional arrival of a supply train from San Antonio—such was life at this frontier post. But there was soon to be excitement enough to stir the blood of the most indolent *mestizo* trooper.

V. THE DESTRUCTION OF THE MISSION

The Arrival of the Comanches.—The rumors concerning the gathering of the Comanche hosts had not been unfounded. It was not until March, 1758, however, that the dreaded visitation took place. On the second day of this month the savages announced their presence by a raid upon the horses of the presidio, which were pastured between the mission and the presidio. Sixty-two horses were stolen. A gingerly pursuit was made by fifteen soldiers, but they did not go far on account of their fear of an ambush. They returned to the presidio with wild tales with which to alarm the none too brave inhabitants. The whole country was said to be literally alive with hidden foes. On March 9th four prospectors on the Pedernales River were attacked by the Indians. The men succeeded in escaping, though not unhurt, and hurriedly made their way to the presidio for refuge.¹

⁵⁴Declaracion juridica del Padre Molina, March 22, 1758, 10.

¹Dolores to the ministers of the Rio Grande, March 21, 1758, 1.

In view of these occurrences, Captain Parrilla tried to induce Father Terreros and his companions to seek the shelter of the presidio. He made this request several times, but the missionaries did not fear the Indians and resolved to stay at their exposed location. Since they persisted in remaining, Parrilla was compelled to leave them, as he did not feel justified in forcing them to retire.² He refused to increase the guard of five soldiers at the mission, realizing that he needed every available man to defend the presidio. The mission was entirely at the mercy of a hostile force. The total number of persons there reached only seventeen, including four or five Indian servants.³ There were two cannon, with a supply of ammunition, and the stockade, of course, was an additional means of defense. But attack by a large force of Indians could result only in the ultimate overpowering of the small garrison. The presidio itself was handicapped by a lack of men. Four of the soldiers were on the Guadalupe, seven were guarding the cattle at the *rancho* five leagues away, five were at the mission. The large number of women and children made Parrilla's task more difficult, for they were a great encumbrance in time of peril. Every precaution was taken against the attack which was expected at any moment. On the afternoon of the 15th, Captain Parrilla made a final appeal to the priests to retire to the presidio, making a personal trip for the purpose. Father Terreros was firm in his refusal, however, and the little company was reluctantly left to the uncertain mercy of a savage foe.⁴

The Massacre.—A little after sunrise on the morning of March 16, after Father Terreros had said mass and just as Father Santiesteban was beginning the second service, a great commotion was heard in the direction of the river, and presently there could be distinguished in the mission shouts of "Indians! Indians!" The invaders had already begun their acts of violence. Coming upon some of the inhabitants who were astir in the early dawn, they stripped them of their clothing, beat them severely and held them for further torture. The main body of the Indians proceeded

²Parrilla to Dolores, May 22, 1758, 5; the guardian to the Eminent Prefect, April, 1759, 5; Arricivita, *Crónica*, 375.

³Declaracion juridica del Padre Molina, 12.

⁴Parrilla to Dolores, March 27, 1758, 6; same to same, May 22, 1758, 4-5

toward the mission, discharging their firearms as they went. In this volley Andres de Villareal was wounded, but escaped and started for the protection of the mission.⁵

As soon as Father Molina discovered the cause of the excitement and saw the large number of Indians approaching, he ran to the church to warn Father Santiesteban to discontinue the services. The priest at once removed his vestments, but remained in the church, while Molina passed on to notify Father Terreros. A number of the occupants of the mission had already gathered in the room of Father Terreros, the soldiers took their posts, the gate of the stockade was closed, and every precaution taken to guard against injury in case the Indians meant mischief. When the Indians drew near, they saw that the Spaniards were on their guard, and realizing that they would not be able to storm the place without much loss to themselves, they resolved to resort to treachery. By dint of many signs and much bad Spanish they announced that they came as friends to offer their allegiance to the Spaniards. Hearing expressions of amity, the corporal of the guard, Asencio Cadena, mustered up courage enough to venture out into the *patio* or open space in front of the mission. Through the cracks in the stockade he could see Indians peering through, and he at once recognized representatives of the Tejas, Vidades, Tancagues, and other northern tribes with whom he had often been associated. Seeing these old friends, he assured Father Terreros that the Indians meant no harm. Upon the strength of this assertion, Father Terreros and other bold ones went out into the *patio*. An impressive spectacle, according to the testimony of an eyewitness met their gaze. On all sides, as far as the eye could reach, there was a moving, swaying multitude of savages, arrayed in strange garbs and mounted on gaudily equipped horses. Their faces were painted black and crimson, decorated with the most horrifying and repulsive figures, and many wore the skins of wild beasts with the tails hanging down from their heads. The mere sight of them, we are told, was enough to strike terror to the heart of the bravest soldier. All appeared to be armed with guns, sabres, or spears. A number of small boys were present for the purpose of receiving prac-

⁵*Ibid.*, 8-9.

tical instruction in the art of warfare.⁶ From the ground that they occupied, it was estimated that the number of the Indians reached 2000, which, according to Father Molina, was a conservative estimate. He believed that at least 1000 bore firearms.⁷ Upon closer inspection it was seen that Cadena had been right in his classification. The majority of the Indians were probably Comanches, but there were also present many Tejas, Tancagues, Vidaes, Yujuanes, and other tribes who professed friendship for the Spaniards in eastern Texas.⁸

As soon as the savages saw the priests appear and noted the confidence that was placed in their promises, many dismounted and without awaiting permission removed the crossbars from the gate and flung it open. The space between the stockade and the buildings was soon crowded with Indians, who shook hands with the Spaniards and made other friendly demonstrations. The priests immediately brought out a supply of tobacco and other articles which they began to distribute among the throng. The leader seemed to be a big stolid Comanche, dressed in a French uniform, who had not deigned to get off his horse. When Father Molina presented him with four handfuls of tobacco, he accepted it in a very condescending manner, without the slightest show of appreciation, while all the time, in the language of the priest, a false smile played upon his horrible features.⁹ The attitude of this chief aroused the suspicions of the Spaniards, and they began to doubt the good faith of the Indians. Especially was this true when it was seen that they were stealing food from the kitchen, appropriating the cloaks of the soldiers, and securing the horses in the *corral*. They had the boldness to ask for more horses, and when told that the mission had only a few, they inquired whether the presidio had any. The presidio, they were informed, had a great

⁶Declaracion juridica, 1-3.

⁷*Ibid.*, 9; Parrilla to Dolores, March 27, 1758, 5. This estimate was doubtless an exaggeration. Cabello, writing in 1784, said that the invaders numbered 700 (Informe, 46). Bonilla gives the number as 2000 (*Breve Compendio*, 26). Some Orcoquizac Indians later declared that there had been only about 400 (Parrilla to Dolores, May 22, 1758, 9), but this is probably an underestimate.

⁸Parrilla to Dolores, March 27, 1758, 4; Parrilla to the viceroy, July 4, 1758, 4-5; Parrilla to the *Discretorio* of San Fernando, April 8, 1758, *Memorias de Nueva España*, XXVIII, f. 152.

⁹Declaracion juridica del Padre Molina, 3-4.

many horses, and was supplied with everything in abundance. This was said to leave the impression that the fort lacked nothing for defense. The Indians were then asked if they had come to visit the captain of the presidio. They replied that they wished to do so, but that they were afraid unless the priests should give them a letter for security. Hoping that this might be a means of getting rid of the undesirable guests, who were now searching openly for plunder in the storerooms, Father Terreros consented to give them a letter. While he was writing it, Villareal, who had succeeded in reaching the mission, told about the wound he had received near the river and of the undoubtedly evil purposes of the visitors. Terreros realized that he spoke the truth, but there was now no help for it.¹⁰ He gave the Indians the letter, which was taken in charge by a chief of the Tejas tribe. This chief went to the corral and, taking out one of the Father President's horses which had been left undisturbed, signified his intention of riding to the presidio. Terreros objected to this, whereupon the Indian quickly seized his gun and placed the muzzle against the horse's head. At this action, the priest ceased his objections, and the Teja set out toward the presidio, accompanied by a large number of Indians.

Although the Indians were prowling around the premises stealing everything that took their fancy, the priests pretended not to notice it, and did everything possible to conciliate them. Terreros entered into a conversation with some Tejas Indians about their country, in which he had lived for a while. They assured the priest that they had no desire to harm the Spaniards, and wished only to fight the Apaches, who had killed some of their people. After a short time, the Tejas chief returned, announcing that not only had he been refused admission to the presidio, but that three of his warriors had been killed and one wounded. The short time that he had been gone convinced the Spaniards that he was lying, but, nevertheless, Father Terreros agreed to accompany him to see that he was given a kind reception. True to his word, the brave father prepared to start, accompanied by a soldier named Joseph García. When they were ready, the chief could not be seen, and Father Terreros, thinking to find him in the throng outside of the stockade, rode toward the gate. As the two men drew near a shot

¹⁰Parrilla to Dolores, March 27, 1758, 2.

rang out, and with a cry Father Terreros fell from his horse, mortally wounded. At the same time, a murderous volley from the savages instantly killed García. The thin veil of friendship was now torn aside, and a fierce combat began. The unfortunate Spaniards made a desperate effort to reach safety, but all did not succeed in escaping, and when the survivors had gained the President's room it was found that Father Santiesteban, Lázaro de Ayala and Enrique Gutiérrez, had also fallen victims to the sudden onslaught of the savages. There were now left Father Molina and eight other men. The Indian servants had escaped at the first news of the enemy. The priest had a broken arm, and several others were wounded, but with desperate energy they barricaded the doors and made ready to defend their lives to the last.¹¹

The Indians set fire to the stockade, to the buildings already sacked, and to the one occupied by the besieged, and busied themselves in plundering the storerooms of the rich provisions laid up there. The dead priests were despoiled of their habits and their bodies mutilated, that of Father Santiesteban being decapitated. The images of the saints were profaned or destroyed, the cattle in the *corral* were killed, and all possible damage inflicted. This could be seen by the Spaniards through the loopholes of their quarters, and they did not doubt but that the flames would soon reach them and force them to expose themselves to the greater fury of the savages. The latter, however, seemed confident that the fire would do its work, and gave little concern to the prisoners, devoting their attention to the agreeable work of pillage and destruction.¹²

Captain Parrilla Sends Aid.—At the first commotion caused by the assailants in the early morning, the Indian servants of the mission had made their escape, and one had reached the presidio, giving Captain Parrilla his first information concerning the approach of the *Norteños*. Parrilla had at once sent out a squad of nine men to reinforce the mission guard and report the state of affairs. Before this force reached the mission, they were fallen upon by a large number of Indians. Two were killed outright, Joseph Vas-

¹¹Dolores to the ministers of Rio Grande, March 21, 1758, 2; *Declaracion juridica*, 4-6.

¹²*Ibid.*, 6; Dolores to the ministers of the Rio Grande, 2-4; Parrilla to Dolores, March 27, 1758, 3.

quez was wounded and fell from his horse, being left for dead by the Indians, who continued the pursuit of the remaining six. All were wounded, but succeeded in reaching the shelter of the presidio. The Indians did not dare assault the fort, and contented themselves with burning the isolated buildings and destroying the newly planted crops. They prevented, however, any immediate relief being sent to the missionaries, for Parrilla thought that he had all he could do to defend his post.¹³

At about eight o'clock in the morning the imprisoned men in the mission were startled to hear a knocking at the door and a voice asking admittance and confession. The door was hastily opened, and Joseph Vasquez, one of the relief party, staggered into the room, naked, and bleeding from a bad wound in the chest. He told a wonderful story of his escape. When he fell from his horse, he said, the Indians had stripped him of his clothing and left him for dead. He had then dragged himself to the mission, where he was discovered by two Indians, who seized him and pitched him into the burning stockade, thinking that the fire would extinguish the little life left in him. From this new peril he had also miraculously escaped, and had then made his way to the room, unobserved by the feasting savages.¹⁴

All day long and far into the night the Indians continued their orgies and the little company of Spaniards still lived. They remained in the room of the Father President until shortly after noon, when the flames reached them and forced them to flee. Thanks to the carelessness of the enemy, they succeeded in making their way into another room in the church building. Their escape being discovered, however, fire was again set to the new place of refuge, and a further retreat was made before the advancing flames. They went into the small chapel, which, although in flames, was less dilapidated than the other ruins. From this time, the Indians, believing them dead, paid no further attention to them.¹⁵

But rescue was at hand. As soon as darkness fell, Parrilla sent out a sergeant with fourteen men to reconnoiter and to learn

¹³Parrilla to Dolores, March 27, 1758, 3-4.

¹⁴Declaracion juridica, 7-8.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, 6-7.

whether an attack upon the Indians would be feasible. No hope was entertained that the occupants of the mission were still alive, for the flames had been seen, and the presidio itself had experienced the hostility of the Indians. The soldiers were perceived as soon as they approached, and with shouts of warning the Indians prepared for defense. Had they known the small force they had to contend with, they could easily have overpowered the Spaniards. But they feared attack from a large force, and cautiously withdrew to a more advantageous position.¹⁶

The withdrawal of the Indians afforded the imprisoned Spaniards the long hoped for chance of escape. Only four were still alive, and one of these, Juan Antonio Gutiérrez, was too badly wounded to leave the church.¹⁷ Father Molina, a mule-driver named Nicolas, and a soldier (probably Joseph Vasquez), although wounded themselves, were able to abandon the ill-fated place. Nicolas was the first to go.¹⁸ Then, according to the uncorroborated statement of the soldier, he had heroically ventured forth, bearing Father Molina upon his back. They were detected, he said, and fired at, whereupon he fell to the ground unconscious. When he recovered his senses, the priest was not to be seen. He himself did not rest until he reached San Antonio. He was wounded in the shoulder, and from the position of the wound it was judged that the bullet had passed entirely through the body of the priest. To the fact that its force had thus been spent, the soldier pointed out, he owed his life.¹⁹

But Father Molina was not dead, and since he says nothing of the incident narrated by the soldier, we should accept that hero's statement with caution. According to Father Molina's own version, he struck out from the mission toward the south, seeking the most hidden paths, and on the morning of the 18th, having made a great detour to the north again, he arrived at the presidio. It had taken him a day and two nights to reach a point only three miles away.²⁰ He found the occupants of the presidio in a state of

¹⁶Parrilla to Dolores, May 22, 1758, 8-9.

¹⁷Declaracion juridica, 7.

¹⁸Dolores to the ministers of the Rio Grande, 3.

¹⁹*Ibid.*

²⁰Declaracion juridica del Padre Molina, 9.

panic. Another attack was expected at any moment, and no one dared stir outside of the fort.²¹

The Burial of the Dead.—Four days passed without further incident, and by the 20th Captain Parrilla judged it safe to investigate the damage that had been done at the mission. A scene of desolation met the eyes of the party. Practically everything had been destroyed. The first care was given to the burial of the dead. The following had been killed: Fathers Terreros and Santiesteban, Joseph García, Enrique Gutiérrez, Lázaro de Ayala, Asencio Cadena, Andrés de Villareal, and Juan Antonio Gutiérrez, who had succumbed to his wounds.²² The bodies of Father Terreros and two soldiers were buried in the church cemetery. The others were interred at the places where their remains were found. Joaquín García and Luis Chirinos, of the first squad sent out by Parrilla, were buried where they fell. At first the searchers could not find the body of Father Santiesteban, and it was supposed that it had been entirely consumed by the flames. A few days later, however, it was discovered, the head having been completely severed from the body. He was also interred in the cemetery beside the grave of Father Terreros. The total number of victims of the treacherous attack was ten.²³

The Spread of the News.—On the night of the massacre, the 16th, Captain Parrilla sent two messengers to San Antonio to report the treachery of the Indians and to ask for aid. They were preceded by the fugitive soldier, who had arrived on the 19th, and the news was already known. In answer to the appeal for help, a lieutenant and eighteen men were immediately despatched to the San Sabá.²⁴

There was great opposition to the sending of aid, for as much alarm was felt at San Antonio as at the presidio of San Luis de las Amarillas. Many rumors were rife that the Indians were en route to the capital, and it was feared that it would meet the same fate as the mission. The people at the little settlement on the Guadalupe River hurriedly retired to Béxar, horses and cattle were

²¹Parrilla to Dolores, March 27, 1758, 4.

²²Declaracion juridica, 7.

²³Parrilla to Dolores, March 27, 1758, 6; same to *Discretorio* of San Fernando, April 8, 1758, *Memorias de Nueva España*, XXVIII, f. 152; Parrilla to Lara, April 8, 1758, 1-2.

²⁴Dolores to the ministers of the Rio Grande, March 21, 1758, 4.

driven in for shelter, and every precaution taken against the coming of the savages. The news reached Governor Barrios on April 3 at Nacogdoches, where he was busy with the removal of the presidio of Orcoquisac. He at once started for San Antonio to take charge of the defense of the capital, but high water prevented the continuance of his journey.²⁵

On March 23d Captain Parrilla despatched two Indians to San Antonio with further details of the attack, and requested Father Dolores to send him a force of mission Indians. Four days later the Indians returned to the presidio, reporting that they had lost their horses on the Chanas (Llano) River, and had been compelled to return. Parrilla believed their return was due to fear of the enemy, and he did not censure them. But in order to ensure the transmission of the dispatches, he sent out Lieutenant Juan Galban with four soldiers. In Parrilla's letter to Father Dolores additional light is thrown upon the state of affairs at the presidio. All of the cattle, about 2000 head in all, had been abandoned because of the great danger of guarding them. There were only provisions enough to last a week, and haste was imperative. Unless help should be sent from San Antonio, he said, the destruction of the whole settlement was inevitable.²⁶

No more succor was sent from San Antonio. Father Dolores did not think it wise to send any mission Indians. While five hundred were available and might be of great service behind the mission walls, they would be of little value, he said, in an open battle such as they might have to fight if they went to San Sabá. Captain Urrutia of the presidio of Bexar had only five soldiers left, three being assigned to each of the five missions, and he was of course unable to send further aid. He despatched couriers to all of the neighboring settlements, however, notifying Adaes, La Bahía, Rio Grande, Monclova, Santa Rosa, and Nuevo León that unless reinforcements and ammunition were sent the entire province of Texas would be destroyed.²⁷

²⁵Carta del R. P. Presidente sobre todo lo acaecido en las muertes de Sn Saba, 1 p.; Dolores to the ministers of Rio Grande, 4-6; Nacogdoches Archives, Doc. No. 487 (Bolton MS. Notes: Miscellaneous, 1750-1825, p. 6); the viceroy to the cabildo and citizens of San Fernando de Austria, June 7, 1758, *Historia*, Vol. 95, 182.

²⁶Parrilla to Dolores, March 27, 1758, 1, 6.

²⁷Carta del R. P. Presidente sobre todo lo acaecido en las muertes de Sn Saba; Dolores to the ministers of Rio Grande, 4-6.

The news had reached the viceroy twenty-three days after the attack, and he immediately took steps to avert the threatened danger to the frontier province. On April 7th and 13th he issued decrees ordering the governors of Coahuila, Nuevo León, and Texas to send to San Sabá whatever aid might be demanded of them. On account of the general alarm, however, it was very hard to secure obedience. As late as August 23 he was forced to issue a third order to the same effect.²⁸ The whole country was frightened by the dastardly treachery of the hitherto friendly northern tribes.

The Causes for the Attack.—According to the best contemporary evidence at hand, the causes for the assault upon the mission were three in number: First and foremost, no doubt, was the jealousy felt by the northern tribes of the intimate relations between the Spaniards and the Apaches—a jealousy inspired not by affection but by fear. The establishment of the presidio upon the San Sabá River had from the first been regarded by the Comanches and their allies as a virtual declaration of war against themselves, and they believed that eventually the Apaches would induce the soldiers to aid them in a great campaign.²⁹ The Apaches had done much to increase this distrust for the Spaniards. When making raids into the territory of their enemies, they would often leave shoes and other articles of clothing worn by the soldiers in order to throw suspicion upon them. Then, too, the spies of the northern tribes, seeing the Apaches return to the neighborhood of the presidio, and observing the joint buffalo hunts that were made, naturally reported that the Spaniards were in active league with the Apaches against their own people.³⁰ That this belief was general and of long standing is shown by the statement of a Taguayas chief in eastern Texas in 1765, seven years later. He declared that he was unwilling to remain at peace with the Spaniards at San Sabá because they had aided his mortal enemies, the Apaches, who were great thieves and murderers. If the Spaniards would withdraw their protection from the Apaches, he said, the Taguayas would become friends.³¹

²⁸Decrees of the viceroy of April 7 and 13, 1758, in Cumanches at Espiritu Santo, 1-2; the viceroy to Martos, Barrios, and Junco y Espriella, August 23, 1758, *Historia*, Vol. 95, 172.

²⁹The guardian to the Eminent Prefect, April, 1759, 5.

³⁰Cabello, *Informe*, 45-46.

³¹Testimonio de la debolucion, 8.

Another reason for the attack was believed to be the instigation of the French. There was no doubt that the French were supplying the northern tribes with firearms through the trade that they carried on with them. But in Texas it was firmly believed that in addition to this indirect aid the French had encouraged the Indians by their presence at the massacre. This suspicion was increased by the reports that were brought back from Louisiana. Many of the horses and mules stolen from San Sabá were said to be in the French fort at Natchitoches, and many of the mission ornaments were said to have found their way into the hands of the French. No less a personage than Governor Barrios accused the French of complicity in the attack. The French indignantly denied the accusations, and there is little reason for believing that they were in any way directly responsible for the outrage. A third cause for the attack was the natural desire of the Indians to plunder the rich stores of the mission. The presence of eatables alone was a strong incentive. The primary cause, however, was undoubtedly jealousy of the Apaches.³²

Although the subsequent history of the Apache mission project must be reserved for a future paper, it may be added here that two years later a great campaign was made against the northern tribes, in which the Spaniards were so badly defeated that it was declared that never had such a disgraceful rout been experienced since the landing of Cortés in New Spain. The attempt to convert the Apaches was continued, however, two other missions being established for them a few years later—but not on the San Sabá River. For some ten years more the Apaches successfully hoodwinked the Spaniards, and the presidio remained at the San Sabá. Finally, however, the evident insincerity of the Indians could no longer be doubted, and a complete change in policy was made. An alliance was entered into with the northern tribes and a bitter war of extermination begun against the Apaches.

³²Decree of the viceroy, April 13, 1758, in Cumanches at Espiritu Santo, 1; Piszina to the viceroy, May 1, 1758, Autos fijos a pedimento, 108; Parrilla to the viceroy, July 4, 1758. 6; Reales Cédulas, Tomo 78, No. 120, August 12, 1758.

CORRESPONDENCE FROM THE BRITISH ARCHIVES
CONCERNING TEXAS, 1837-1846

X

EDITED BY EPHRAIM DOUGLASS ADAMS

ELLIOT TO ABERDEEN¹

Secret.

Galveston October 31st. 1843.

My Lord,

In a conversation with the President yesterday, he placed in my hand an original despatch from Mr. Van Zandt, Chargé d' Affaires from this Republic in the United States, to the Secretary of State of Texas, dated at Washington on the 18th Ultimo. The President did not offer to furnish me with a Copy of the despatch, neither did I consider it suitable to ask for one, and I can therefore only furnish Your Lordship with a general statement of its contents from memory. But I read it with attention, and I do not think that any material point has escaped my notice.

Mr. Van Zandt begins by stating, that he had called a day or two before at the Office of the Secretary of State upon a subject of trifling importance but Mr. Upshur interrupted his representations by remarking that He was glad to see him, for he had been on the point of writing to request him to converse on a matter of moment. He then entered eagerly into the subject of the annexation of Texas to the United States, expressing much hope that the Government of Texas had not changed it's policy upon that point. The President informed me, at this place of Mr. Van Zandt's despatch, that upon announcing the late Armistice to that Gentleman, He had been desired to take an occasion of verbally acquainting the Government of the United States, that the general Instructions to the Agents of this Government near that of the United States upon the subject of Annexation must be considered to be no longer of force, I use General Houston's language; "that, that door was closed."

¹F. O., Texas, Vol. 6.

Mr. Van Zandt in reply to Mr. Upshur's first observation adverted to an expression in a despatch of the Secretary of State of Texas, (quoted in his own despatch of the 18 September) to the effect that it did not seem to the Government of Texas that the acknowledgment of the Independence of Texas by Mexico would interpose an insurmountable obstacle to annexation with the United States, if that combination should therefore be considered convenient. It seemed on the contrary, that it might smooth the way to that result, by means of subsequent treaty between the two Countries

Both the President and the Secretary of State, with whom I have conversed this morning, told me that this observation had been thrown out to induce the more hearty efforts of the Government of the United States with that of Mexico to secure the acknowledgment of their Independence by Mexico; but having that Independence recognized, it was not the wish of the present Government, nor they firmly believed would it be found to be that of the majority of this people, that any treaty or other scheme of Annexation should be entertained.

Returning to Mr Upshur's conversation, as reported by Mr Van Zandt in the despatch of the 18th. September, I should inform Your Lordship that it conveyed generally the determination of the Government of the United States to endeavour to effect the annexation of Texas during the next Session, if the Government of Texas consented to the promotion of such an arrangement.

To Mr. Van Zandt's remarks (speaking in that particular, as an unauthorized person) that though it certainly seemed to him that such a proposal might find favor in Texas, still he could not but remind Mr. Upshur of the former failure of the scheme of annexation in the United States, Mr. Upshur replied that circumstances had materially changed since, that it was the great measure of the present administration; that they had already sounded leading persons in the Senate, and that though it was probable they would be stormily opposed, still they believed they should be able to carry the project.

He wished Mr Van Zandt to report the subject of the present conversation to Texas by express, and to ask for immediate instructions in order that affairs might be sufficiently advanced by

the next meeting of Congress in the United States. But Mr. Van Zandt did not consider there was any need for an express, probably because he had nothing to transmit, but the statement of a personal conference, for I remarked that nothing was delivered to Mr Van Zandt in a written form, and that Mr Upshur declined to furnish him with a Copy of the Instructions to General Thompson at Mexico, though he suffered me [him] to peruse them.

Mr Van Zandt closes his despatch with a request for early Instructions, and a decided expression of his own opinion that the present administration at Washington is perfectly sincere in these professions and purposes, but leaving it to his own Government to form it's own judgment of their political strength to carry out such a scheme

I said I hoped I was not asking too much in requesting to know in what sense this Government proposed to reply to these overtures.

General Houston answered that Mr Van Zandt would be instructed to communicate verbally that it did not seem to the Government of Texas to be convenient or necessary to entertain such proposals at all, till the Senate of the United States had manifested its readiness by resolution to treat with Texas, upon the subject of Annexation

I did not pursue the conversation for the moment, desiring to reflect upon the course that it might be convenient to take in the present state of my information. But I have now to report the subject of a conference which I sought with the President and the Secretary of State this morning.

Attentively considering the Communication from Washington which the President had been so good as to shew me, and generally the indications of public feeling, and violent attack to which he had been exposed on account of some supposed undue and dangerous influence on the part of Her Majesty's Government in the Affairs of Texas, I thought that it was incumbent upon me to declare (after renewed examination of my communications from Your Lordship) the scope and sum of Her Majesty's purposes concerning the settlement of the dispute between Mexico and Texas.

The President might assure himself that the Queen continued to take a lively interest, in the prosperity and Independence of

Texas; and moved by a sincere desire to hasten the close of a fruitless and painful Warfare, Her Majesty's Government would willingly use every friendly effort in a strictly impartial sense, to consolidate a peace upon terms conducive to the honor, advantage, and stability of both the parties engaged in this contest.

This was the plain purport of all my communications from Her Majesty's Government.

But observing from what had passed at Washington that another phase of these affairs had now presented itself, I hoped the President would give me leave to offer some reflections arising out of that condition of things. I spoke of course without authority. If however His Excellency felt himself in a situation to assure Her Majesty's Government that he had entire confidence in the good will and ability of the Government of the United States to secure the recognition of the bonâ fide, and durable Independence of Texas by Mexico, by friendly means, and further that the associations between the people of this Country and of the United States, made it an object of moment to this Government that their affairs at Mexico, should be left to the countenance of the United States, it certainly was my opinion that Her Majesty's Government would readily desist from pressing the subject in that quarter, neither could I suppose that Her Majesty's Government would take umbrage at the expression of a such a wish upon the part of this Government. How far it might be conducive to a speedy settlement of these difficulties, and to the well understood interests of the people of Texas that the Government of Mexico should find itself negotiating with the Government of the United States for the acknowledgment of the Independence of Texas, to be followed by a treaty of Annexation with that Union, were points upon which it did not belong to me to offer any opinions.

I hope, however, that His Excellency would authorize me to make a communication of his own views and intentions upon these proposals of the Government of the United States to Your Lordship

The President requested me to convey the expressions of the gratitude of the Government of Texas for the kind and powerful support they had received from that of Her Majesty; earnestly to request that there should be no relaxation in these friendly

efforts to hasten the acknowledgment of the Independence of Texas by Mexico, to state with perfect plainness that the Government of Texas had no ground to consider the professions of the Government of the United States to be directed by other motives than those of internal convenience; and that no reliance was placed upon their hearty interposition for the settlement of this dispute upon the basis of the Independence of Texas. But that even if the case were otherwise, the Government of Texas could never so far forget what was due to the Government of Her Majesty from which it had received earnestness of helpfulness, or to its own interests, as to postpone the[ir] support to any other.

Her Majesty's Government might rest assured that with the Independence of Texas recognized by Mexico, He would never consent to any treaty or other project of annexation to the United States, and He had a conviction that the people would sustain him in that determination. He had formerly been favorable to such a Combination. But the United States had rejected the proposals of this Country in its time of difficulty; neither was the subsequent conduct of that Government calculated to induce the Government and people of Texas in this mended state of things, to sacrifice their true and lasting advantage to the policy of party in that Country.

The Government of the United States had been appealed to for interference in these affairs simultaneously with the Government of Her Majesty and that of the King of the French, and if those Government's had taken a more active and decided part in securing the recognition of their Independence, the President could see and feel that they had entitled themselves to the gratitude and confidence of Texas, but He could not observe that the existence of such feelings furnished just ground of complaint or uneasiness to the Government of the United States. He learnt that the Government of the United States was now taking a very lively interest in their efforts, as he anticipated would be the case as soon as they heard of the Armistice, and the withdrawal of the Instructions respecting annexation; But up to this moment the Government of Texas had not been favored with one word in a written form in explanation of their purposes and proceedings. They were no doubt kind, but what they were he could not positively say.

I remarked to the President that this might be a convenient

occasion to advert to one point which appeared to be the foundation of the existing misconception respecting the purposes of Her Majesty's Government. The subject to which I alluded was the desire of Her Majesty's Government for the Abolition of Slavery in Texas, collected from what had appeared in the public prints, and particularly from a late Conversation in the House of Lords. There was nothing here to occasion surprize or uneasiness. The Government of Texas in common with the whole world must have been perfectly aware of the settled feeling of the British Government and Nation upon the subject of Slavery, and though I had not yet received Instructions to press that topic, I naturally concluded that such instructions would soon reach me.

Her Majesty's Government would probably dwell upon the wrongfulness of Slavery; on the deplorable error of setting out in the life and fortunes of a Nation, with all its prospects based upon an Institution, condemned and decaying every where, acknowledgedly a cancer where it did exist, and the subject of increasing want of confidence, and aversion in States, from which it had passed away

These and other grounds of reasoning would possibly be strongly pressed upon the attention of this Government, but the President was too well acquainted with the character of the British Government to suppose that it would be unmindful of the just right of this Government and people to decide for themselves.

General Houston had not the least uneasiness upon such a point; And without entering at all into this particular Subject, He could at least say generally that the views of Her Majesty's Government would always receive the most attentive consideration of the Government and people of Texas.

Implicit reliance may be place in the sincerity and steadiness of the opinions General Houston expressed in this Conversation; but I certainly perceive no such ground to depend upon the course of the people of Texas, if the project of annexation should be presented to them.

The President would no doubt use strenuous efforts in the sense he has declared, but his administration closes in the Month of December 1844, and if He is not succeeded by a person influenced by the same policy, the uncertainty upon the subject would be much encreased.

Your Lordship will perhaps be already informed as to these intentions of the Government of the United States, and no doubt of their ability in respect to them; But I have nevertheless felt it my duty to report this information in detail, and I will take the liberty to add an opinion which I offered to the President in a private way, that is, that their project seems to be shaped with the alternative intention of settling the matter in the way that pleases them, or of disordering any other settlement, and of the two, it seemed to me, that the last was the more hopeful result, for I did not believe that the Government of the United States, had any confidence in their own power to carry out a project of annexation. But the agitation of it could hardly fail to alarm the Government of Mexico.

I should mention that the American Schooner of War "Flirt" arrived here on the 17th. Instant with Despatches for General Murphy, and referring to the date of her departure from Norfolk (the 30th. Ultimo) I conclude that the intelligence she brings is to the effect related in Mr Van Zandt's despatch. But General Murphy does not appear to have been authorized to commit himself in writing upon the subject.

General Houston and Mr Jones told me, that incredible as it seems, they were disposed to believe that the Government of the United States had listened to hastily to some extravagant reports from here, as to the sinister purposes of Her Majesty's Government in connexion with the Governments of Mexico, and of Texas for the assumption of this Country in Her Majesty's name, and assured me that a small squadron of American Ships of War would shortly follow the Schooner. I remarked that these rumours were no doubt calculated to excite the people of this Country, and by throwing discredit upon General Houston to facilitate the frustration of his negotiations with Mexico; but I would undertake to say that the Government of the United States never attached the least credit to such folly and falsehood.

Charles Elliot.

The Earl of Aberdeen, K. T.

ELLIOT TO ABERDEEN²No. 30.³

Galveston, November 13th. 1843.

My Lord,

I have the honor to acknowledge Mr Addington's despatch No 12;⁴ and I avail myself of this occasion to report that intelligence has reached this place from Matamoras to the 29th. Ultimo, announcing that the Commissioners from this Government had proceeded to Sabinas (about 90 leagues to the Northward of Matamoras) to meet General Woll and arrange the terms of the truce. It is probable that a reference will be necessary both to Mexico and to this Government before the conditions are finally adjusted.

Having heard through the public press of some misunderstanding at Mexico upon the subject of an English Ensign, displayed amongst some flags said to have been taken by the forces of that Republic.⁵ I think it may be convenient to forward to Your Lordship a newspaper containing an account of the manner in which that Ensign fell into the hands of the Mexican Government.⁶ I also take the opportunity of this despatch to mention that the trade between Mexico and the Western parts of this Country has once more revived with considerable vigour, under the influence of a state of truce, and particularly of the prohibitory regulations of the Mexican Government, so favourable to the promotion of extensive illicit traffic.

Charles Elliot.

The Earl of Aberdeen, K. T.

²F. O., Texas, Vol. 6.³Elliot to Aberdeen, No. 29, September 30, 1843, has been omitted. It referred to the "Little Penn' claims, and contained copies of Jones to Elliot, September 16, and Elliot to Jones, September 28, 1843, which are in Garrison, *Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas*, III, 1128 and 1139, in Am. Hist. Assoc. *Report*, 1908, II.⁴October 3, 1843.⁵September 28, 1843, while attending a public ball, Doyle observed draped among "trophies taken in war," an English boat flag. He demanded its removal, was refused, and later the Mexican government declined to give it up to him. As a result, he discontinued diplomatic relations with Mexico until ordered by Aberdeen to resume them. (Adams, *British Interest and Activities in Texas*, 153-154.)⁶Not found.

KENNEDY TO ABERDEEN⁷

No. 8.

British Consulate.
Galveston, November 13th 1843.

My Lord,

I have the honor to enclose a return in duplicate, relating to the following Subjects:—

Custom Laws of Texas,
Wreck Masters and their Duties.
Maritime Jurisdiction.
Collectoral Districts.⁸

William Kennedy.

The Earl of Aberdeen, K. T.

ELLIOT TO ABERDEEN⁹

No. 32.¹⁰

Galveston, November. 29th. 1843.

My Lord,

I have the honor to transmit herewith the copy of a dispatch which I have this day addressed to Mr. Doyle at Mexico, in reply to a despatch from him, announcing the interruption of his official intercourse with the Government of Mexico, and I also take the liberty to forward an extract from a private letter which I have sent to him with my public Communication.

Begging to refer Your Lordship to the appeal made by General McLeod¹¹ in his letter to me of the 26th. Instant (Inclosure No 2 in my despatch to Mr. Doyle) in behalf of Mr Antonio Navarro, I venture to hope that Your Lordship will compassionate his situation, and instruct Her Majesty's Minister at Mexico to intercede in his favor on the renewal of the public intercourse between the two Governments.

His fate has always been the subject of great solicitude to the Government and people of Texas, and I am sure they would be

⁷F. O., Texas, Vol. 7.

⁸Kennedy merely summarized the laws on these subjects. They can be conveniently consulted in Gammel, *Laws of Texas*.

⁹F. O., Texas, Vol. 6.

¹⁰Elliot to Aberdeen, No. 31, is missing from the archives.

¹¹Hugh McLeod, a graduate of the United States Military Academy (1835). He resigned from the army, practiced law, and early joined Texas in resisting Mexico. He commanded the Sante Fé expedition, was a member of the Texan Congress, 1842-1843, served in the Mexican War, and later on the Confederate side in the Civil War. (Appleton, *Dict. of Am. Biog.*)

grateful for the kind Offices of Her Majesty's Government. It has also occurred to me that acts of public clemency at the suggestion of Her Majesty's Government may be amongst the most pleasing proofs of respect and atonement which the Government of Mexico can afford for its late unsuitable conduct.

Charles Elliot

The Earl of Aberdeen. K. T.

ELLIOT TO DOYLE¹²

[Enclosure].

Galveston, November 29th 1843.

Sir,

By the last arrival from New Orleans, I have had the honor to receive Your Despatch of the 5th. Ultimo, acquainting me that you had been compelled to suspend all diplomatic intercourse with the Government of Mexico 'till you had received further Instructions from Her Majesty's Government.

Accounts of the circumstance which induced that event had already reached this place through the press of the United States, and in a dispatch to Lord Aberdeen, dated on the [13th.] Inst which will go to England by the Mail of the 1st Proximo from Boston, I had thought it might be convenient to forward His Lordship the copy of a Newspaper [of which another copy is herewith transmitted] containing a statement of the manner in which the English flag in question fell into the hands of the Mexican Government.¹³

Since the receipt of your despatch of the 5th Ultimo, I have communicated with the Editor of this paper, and I learn from him that He received his information direct from General Green, who was present in the affair at Meir.

I have also ascertained from other respectable persons who had conversed with General Green upon this subject whilst He was here, that no English flag was displayed in that conflict, or upon any other occasion in the course of the operations which closed at that place.

The flag was used by the man into whose possession it had fallen, as a sleeping covering, and was found by the Mexicans, either, in his Knapsack, or it may be as a wrapper to his kit.

¹²F. O., Texas, Vol. 6.

¹³See Elliot to Aberdeen, No. 30, November 13, 1843.

Thinking it possible that there may be some pretension that a British flag was captured, when the persons composing the "Santa Fé" expedition surrendered, I have taken an opportunity of ascertaining directly from General H. McLeod who commanded that force, that no English flag was ever used in that service, or to the best of his knowledge was in the possession of any person in that expedition.

Charles Elliot.

Percy W. Doyle, Esqr

Copy.

Charles Elliot.

[Endorsed.]. Inclosure. 1. In Captn Elliot's No. 32. November 29. 1843.

M'LEOD TO ELLIOT¹⁴

[Enclosure.]

Galveston.

November. 26th. 1843.

Sir,

Inage Morris informed me on yesterday that you had desired to learn from me, whether any British flag accompanied me in the Expedition to Santa Fé, in 1841, under my command.—No such flag could have been officially used, and if any individual carried one it was without my knowledge—Indeed I am quite sure it was not done.

While addressing you upon this subject, would it be improper, to solicit your kind offices, unofficially, for my unfortunate Companion, Mr Antonio Navarro.—His release would be but an act of justice to himself, and would confer happiness on a large family and numerous friends.

This, if it can be accorded, I respectfully solicit in the name of General Lamar, under whose authority, as President of this Republic, that Expedition was sent as well as in that of.

H. McLeod.

True Copy.

Charles Elliot

To. Honl. Chas. Elliot.

H. B. M. Chargé d' Affaires

[Endorsed.]. Inclosure No. 2. In Captn. Elliot's No 32. November. 29. 1843.

¹⁴F. O., Texas, Vol. 6.

ELLIOT TO DOYLE¹⁵

Private Note.

Galveston November 29. 1843.

Brought up in a Military profession I take the liberty of remarking, that the triumphant display of flags as National trophies, always requires unequivocal proof that they were actually fought under, and captured in conflict.

Ships of War, for example, usually carry the flags of all Maritime Powers, amongst their stores, but when a Ship of War of one nation is taken by a Ship of another, it would be absurd and insulting to display any other Ensign in triumph than that of the Country to which the captured vessel belonged.

If the British flag had been displayed and fought under at Meir, which it certainly was not, the right course would have been to forward a detailed and authentic statement of the facts to H. M. Government, with a request to know if any authority had been given for the use of the British National Colours to the persons from whom they were taken, within the limits of the Mexican territory or elsewhere.

It was not time for the Mexican Government to take any further proceedings with respect to that flag 'till they had been formally answered in that particular.

Persons who were captured in Mexico, fighting under National Colours which they had no authority to use, would no doubt be liable to be treated as mere marauders.

But the triumphal display of the flag of a friendly Power, taken from such persons, is really much less an act of disrespect to that Country, [foolishly disrespectful as it is] than of total want of regard to the character of the Nation, exhibiting such spoils amongst the trophies of honorable and regular War.

Whatever degree of dissatisfaction this impertinence may occasion Her Majesty's Government, it is manifest that the offence is much more serious against the honor and dignity of Mexico. For if it had been true that the people at Meir had fought under a British flag it would be equally [true] that, that very fact had rendered them within the description of marauders, or banditti, and Nations do not make triumphal display of the proofs of their prowess, over persons in that category, at the disregard too, of the

¹⁵F. O., Texas, Vol. 6. The letter was not addressed, but was probably from Elliot to Doyle.

obligations of public comity to friendly Powers. The statement, however, that a British flag was taken in action at all, is void of foundation, and the unavoidable conclusion is, that the Mexican Government, has fabricated an explanation of it's conduct, which would have been discreditable in the last degree if it had been faithful.

If there is any military person amongst your colleagues, I am sure he will testify to the correctness of this exposition of military usage, and probably satisfy the Mexican Government of the unfortunate attitude in which it has placed itself by this unseemly adoption of the false report of this Commanding officer at Meir. His immediate and exemplary punishment, and the most signal, and public proof of their own respect for the flag of a friendly Power, are steps far more necessary for their own relief, from a very discreditable scrape, than for the sake of any other consideration. It will no doubt be very easy for H. M. Government to set this nonsense to rights, so far as the dignity of Great Britain is concerned, but the Mexican Government should be told by some friendly adviser, that what they do spontaneously is what alone can set them to rights in the estimation of other Powers.

Charles Elliot

[Endorsed.] Inclosure 3. In Captn. Elliot's No 32. November 29. 1843.

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

The Life of Robert Toombs, by Ulrich Bonnell Phillips, Ph. D., Professor of American History in the University of Michigan. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1913. Pp. xi., 281. \$2.00.)

A good life of Robert Toombs has long been needed, partly because too little has been known of the man who, from the death of Calhoun to 1860, was the foremost representative of southern interests in Congress, and partly because a study of his career reveals so much of interest to the student of the ante-bellum conditions and problems of the South. It is, therefore, gratifying that the task of revealing Toombs has been undertaken by one so competent as Professor Phillips. Disclaiming any leaning toward hero-worship, Professor Phillips has endeavored "to use the career of Toombs as a central theme in describing the successive problems which the people of Georgia and the South confronted and the policies which they followed in their efforts at solving them."

Beginning with a brief but interesting account of conditions in "Middle Georgia" in the early nineteenth century, the author traces Toombs's early career through college, the beginnings of his law practice, and his entry into politics as a Whig member of the state legislature, where he became conspicuous as a leader who was more concerned with sound policy than with party advantage. The chapter entitled "A Southern Whig in Congress" contains a most excellent account of the difficult position of the party which stood as the champion of the planting interest when Toombs became a member of Congress in 1844. The next four chapters—"The Proviso Crisis and the Compromise of 1850," "The Georgia Platform," "A Senator in the Fifties," and "Toombs on the Slaveholding Regime"—carry us to 1860. These chapters set forth clearly the very conspicuous part taken by Toombs in Congress and in the affairs of his state during this momentous period, and they also reveal the true quality of the man. The popular estimate of Toombs at that time and afterwards would hardly include conservatism as one of his marked characteristics, yet Professor Phillips has shown that, fundamentally, the great Georgia tribune was conservative. It was the natural result of his habit of looking carefully

into the facts of the case and of his clear-sighted appreciation of what were the facts. His excessive natural ardor often led him into intemperate expressions that gave a superficial appearance of radicalism.

The election crisis of 1860 and the stroke for Southern independence were the beginning of the undoing of Toombs. The election of Jefferson Davis, instead of Toombs, as President of the new Confederacy, Professor Phillips thinks was due to "bungling." As Secretary of State to Davis, Toombs was in an impossible situation; as a brigadier general in the field, he was impatient, captious, a failure. After his resignation from the army and his failure of election to the Confederate Senate, he lapsed more and more into the caustic but helpless critic of the administration, particularly of its financial policies.

Threatened with arrest and imprisonment after the break up of the Confederacy, he fled to Paris, but returned in 1867 and was unmolested. He regained his leadership of the Georgia bar, and took a prominent part in rescuing the state from radical misrule, but never again held office.

In some respects this little volume is a model of what a biography should be. Professor Phillips has adhered faithfully to his idea of making the career of Toombs the central theme of a much broader study, the problems of the cotton-producing, ante-bellum South. Though his Southern sympathies are very much in evidence throughout the book, they are based upon a close study of Southern conditions; and the point of view which he sets forth is so generally unappreciated, that the reviewer feels no desire to criticise.

Much of the material is drawn from the correspondence of Toombs, Stephens and Howell Cobb, edited by Professor Phillips, and appearing since the publication of the biography as Volume II of the 1911 Report of the American Historical Association. The book seems typographically perfect and the index is good.

CHAS. W. RAMSDELL.

NEWS ITEMS

The *Dallas Democrat* (page 7) of November 29, 1913, contains an article by Virginia Quitman McNealus, entitled "A Little Footnote to an Old Chapter," in which are pointed out erroneous statements made in Bancroft's *North Mexican States and Texas*, II, 468. A letter from J. N. Cortina to J. S. Ford, dated October 17, 1891, is printed in proof of the corrections.

SAN ANTONIO ROAD.—At the November conference of the Daughters of the American Revolution at El Paso, Texas, the sum of \$1200 was pledged to begin the erecting of boulders of Texas granite, five feet high, three and one-half by two and one-half feet wide, one side smoothed and inscribed "King's Highway—San Antonio Road, erected by the Daughters of the American Revolution," donor's name and date. It was decided to place these markers five miles apart across the State from the Sabine river to the Rio Grande.

Colonel Henry Exall, president of the Texas Industrial Congress, died at his home in Dallas, on December 29, 1913. Numerous tributes were paid Colonel Exall through the press following his death; a brief biography is printed in *Who's Who in America*, 1912-1913.

Dr. Edward B. Wright, for thirty-five years pastor and for six years pastor emeritus of the First Presbyterian Church of Austin, died at his home January 4, 1914. It was said of him that "he was the best known and the best loved minister that Austin ever had."

Judge James H. McLeary died at Washington, D. C., January 5, 1914. He served in the house of representatives and the senate of Texas, was attorney general from 1880 to 1882, was appointed one of the territorial judges of Montana by President Cleveland, and at the time of death was associate justice of the supreme court of Porto Rico. Biographical sketches of him are printed in *Who's Who in America*, 1912-1913, and in the *San Antonio Express*, January 6, 1914.

Wells Thompson, judge of the twenty-third judicial district, died at his home in Bay City, on January 17, 1914. The *Galveston News* of the day following gives a brief sketch of his life. He graduated from the University of North Carolina in 1859, and two years later from the law department of the University of Georgia. After the close of the war he took up the practice of law at Matagorda, was a member of the constitutional convention of 1866, was elected president of the senate in 1876, and served as a member of the board of codifiers of the laws of Texas in 1895.

James G. Dudley, of Paris, Texas, who was appointed by Governor Campbell one of the commissioners to codify the laws of Texas, died on January 17, 1914. The *Dallas News* of the day following and *Who's Who in America*, 1906-1907, contain brief biographies.

J. M. Oram, an inventor of distinction in electrical and telephone fields, died at his late home in Dallas on January 17, 1914. Mr. Oram wrote the chapter on "The Coming of the Telephone to Dallas" in *A History of Greater Dallas and Vicinity*. The *Dallas News* of January 18 contains a sketch of his life.

The *Houston Chronicle* of January 25, 1914, printed a column, entitled "Stories of Ashbel Smith."

Dr. Frank Rainey died at Austin, February 2, 1914. He became a surgeon during the Civil War, graduated from Tulane University in 1869, and from 1874 until 1895 was superintendent of the Texas school for the blind. A tribute to Dr. Rainey by Judge Fulmore was printed in the *Austin Tribune* of February 8.

The *Galveston News* of March 19 and 20, 1914, contained a brief sketch of the life of Robert G. Murray, who participated in the naval engagements off the coast of Texas and engaged in blockade running during the Civil War.

AFFAIRS OF THE ASSOCIATION

The annual business meeting of the Association was held at the State Library Monday afternoon, March 2, at 2:45. The Executive Council nominated twenty-two members and five life members, who were duly elected by the Association. The Council adopted the following resolution concerning the nomination of Fellows:

"Resolved, That the President shall appoint from among the Fellows of the Executive Council two members to act with himself as a committee on the nomination of Fellows. This committee shall examine the published work of the members whose election is proposed, and shall report thereon to the Council at the annual meeting."

The following officers were elected: President, Judge Z. T. Fulmore; Vice-Presidents, Miss Katie Daffan, Mrs. A. B. Looscan, and Messrs. Beauregard Bryan and R. C. Crane; Corresponding Secretary and Treasurer, Charles W. Ramsdell; Members of the Executive Council, Judge John C. Townes and Professor S. H. Moore. Mr. E. C. Barker is *ex-officio* Recording Secretary and Librarian. The Publication Committee was re-elected without change. The Treasurer presented, duly audited, the report which appears below. It was the sense of the meeting that ex-presidents who withdraw from the Association thereby remove themselves from the Executive Council, and that Fellows similarly remove themselves from the list of Fellows.

For the information of members the Constitution is printed as it now stands, including, without designation, all amendments:

ARTICLE I.—NAME.—This Society shall be called the Texas State Historical Association.

ART. II.—OBJECTS.—The objects of the Association shall be, in general, the promotion of historical studies; and, in particular, the discovery, collection, preservation, and publication of historical material, especially such as relates to Texas.

ART. III.—MEMBERSHIP.—The Association shall consist of Members, Fellows, Life Members, and Honorary Life Members.

(a) *Members*.—Persons recommended by the Executive Council and elected by the Association may become Members.

(b) *Fellows*.—Members who show, by published work, special aptitude for historical investigation may become Fellows. Thirteen Fellows shall be elected by the Association when first organized, and the body thus created may thereafter elect additional Fellows on the nomination of the Executive Council. The number of Fellows shall never exceed fifty.

(c) *Life Members*.—Such benefactors of the Association as shall pay into its treasury at one time the sum of thirty dollars (\$30), or shall present to the Association an equivalent in books, manuscripts, or other acceptable matter, shall be classed as Life Members.

(d) *Honorary Life Members*.—Persons who rendered eminent service to Texas previous to annexation may become Honorary Life Members upon being recommended by the Executive Council and elected by the Association.

ART. IV.—OFFICERS.—The affairs of the Association shall be administered by a President, four Vice-Presidents, a Recording Secretary and Librarian, a Corresponding Secretary and Treasurer, and an Executive Council.

The President, Vice-President, and Corresponding Secretary and Treasurer shall be elected annually by the Association from among the Fellows.

The Professor of History in the University of Texas shall be *ex-officio* Recording Secretary and Librarian of the Association.

The Executive Council, five of which shall constitute a quorum, shall consist of the following: The ex-Presidents, the President, the four Vice-Presidents, the Recording Secretary and Librarian, the Corresponding Secretary and Treasurer, the State Librarian, three Fellows, five Members.

The Association, immediately after organizing, shall elect three Fellows to serve on the Executive Council one, two, and three years, respectively, the term of each to be decided by lot. Thereafter, one Fellow shall be elected annually by the Association for the term of three years.

The Association, immediately after organizing, shall likewise elect five members to serve on the Executive Council one, two,

three, four, and five years, respectively, the term of each to be decided by lot. Thereafter, one Member shall be elected annually by the Association for the term of five years.

ART. V.—DUES.—Each Member shall pay annually into the treasury of the Association the sum of two dollars.

Each Fellow, on being elected, shall pay into the treasury of the Association the sum of five dollars as an initiation fee. The annual dues of Fellows shall be the same as those of Members.

Life Members and Honorary Life Members shall be exempt from all dues.

Members or Fellows may be dropped from the rolls of the Association at the discretion of the Council for non-payment of dues.

ART. VI.—PUBLICATION COMMITTEE.—A Publication Committee, consisting of five persons, shall have the sole charge of the selection and editing of matter for publication. The President and the Recording Secretary and Librarian of the Association shall be *ex-officio* members of this committee; the remaining three members shall be chosen annually by the Fellows from the Executive Council.

ART. VII.—AMENDMENTS.—Amendments to this Constitution shall become operative after being recommended by the Executive Council and approved by two-thirds of the members present and voting at any regular meeting; provided, that notice of the proposed amendment shall be given in the announcement of the meeting.

TREASURER'S REPORT FOR THE YEAR ENDING MARCH 1, 1914

Receipts

	1914	1913	1912
By membership dues	\$1,449 45	\$1,760 68	\$1,539 35
By sale of QUARTERLY.....	127 37	108 80	44 75
By sale of reprints.....	8 50
By sale of bindings.....	7 55	4 50	29 55
By miscellaneous	2 45	7 13	3 28
By life memberships	120 00	390 00
By interest	147 45	142 45	149 45
Total receipts	\$1,854 27	\$2,413 56	\$1,774 88

Expenditures

To printing QUARTERLY	\$1,052 43	\$ 574 21	\$ 775 41
To binding QUARTERLY	46 93	55 63	101 76
To reprinting QUARTERLY		37 25	301 76
To reviews			19 50
To commissions			5 00
To clerical expenses	442 70	424 15	257 60
To miscellaneous	78 83	98 99	108 52
To postage	102 84	158 50	125 00
To stationery	73 67	87 25	27 15
To Powell transcripts		57 74
<hr/>			
Total expenditures	\$1,797 40	\$1,493 72	\$1,721 11
Net profit	56 87	919 84	53 77
<hr/>			
	\$1,854 27	\$2,413 56	\$1,774 88

CHAS. W. RAMSDELL,
Treasurer.

H. Y. BENEDICT,
Auditor.

March 2, 1914.

INDEX TO VOLUME XVII

- Aberdeen, George Gordon, fourth Earl of, 68, 84; letters to, 68-9, 71, 74-6, 82-4, 89, 188-98, 204-6, 306-11, 313-14, 415-24; letters, 193, 306.
- Abolition, discussed, 75 note 24, 76-81, 193, 203-5, 312, 420.
- Acdozas, Agdocas, *see* Deadoses.
- Acopseles Indians, 338.
- Adaes, establishment, 14, 18-20, 159, 173, 180, 183; presidio, 35-6, 336, 346-7, 349, 352, 354, 357-9, 412; mission, 344.
- Adams, Ephraim Douglass, *Correspondence from the British Archives concerning Texas, 1837-1846*, 67-92, 188-206, 306-14, 415-27.
- Adams, John Quincy, diary, extract, 237.
- Addington, Henry Unwin, 422.
- Agdocas, *see* Deadoses.
- Aguayo, Marqués de San Miguel de, expedition, 1719-22, 328, 330, 333.
- Aiken, Joseph, 270 note 19.
- Los Ais (mission), 364.
- Ais, Ayish Indians, *see* Eyeish.
- Alabama Indians, *see* Alibamu.
- Alaman, Lúcas, 219, 239; negotiations with Poinsett, 226-9.
- Alamo, victims from Pennsylvania, 266.
- Alexander, — (Rev.), 46, 293.
- Alexander, —, 301.
- Alexander, Lyman W., 268.
- Alexander, W. G., 270 note 19.
- Alibamu Indians (Alabama), 157.
- Allen, — (Capt.), 268.
- Allen, A. C., 295.
- Allen, William Young (Rev.), diary, 1838-9, extracts, 43-60; biography, 43 note 1; *Reminiscences of Texas, 1838-42*, 283-305.
- Los Almagres, 383, 399.
- Altamira, Marqués de (auditor), opinion, 358.
- Alvord, Clarence W., 321.
- Amarillas, Marqués de las (Viceroy), 385, 400.
- Amaya, Saluad de (Fray), 370-1.
- American Bible Society, first organization in Texas, 50, 289.
- Anathagua Indians, 338.
- Anchoses Indians, mission, 323-78.
- Anda y Altamirano, Mariano de (Fray), connection with the San Xavier missions, 344-5, 359-60, 370-2.
- Andrés, Juan (Fray), connection with San Sabá missions, 391.
- Andrews, S. P. (of League, Andrews & Co.), emancipation scheme, 77-8, 204-5.
- Angeles, Juan de los (Fray), 370.
- Annexation of Texas, discussion, 205, 278-9, 415-21.
- Anonymous commentary, Zacatecas, extract, 333.
- Apache Indians, 263, 330; campaign against, 1732, 328; tribal relations, 333, 344, 354, 358, 362, 413; range, 349, 381; hope for reduction of, 355-6, 358; hostilities, 356-7, 359; attacks upon San Xavier mission, 367-9; mission, San Sabá River, 379-414.
- The Apache mission on the San Sabá River: its founding and failure* (Dunn), 379-414.
- Apapax Indians, 338.
- Aponte, Francisco Cayetano (Fray), connection with San Xavier missions, 367-9, 373.
- Aquodoces, *see* Deadoses.
- Aranda, Miguel (Fray), expedition, 1754, 383.
- Arapaho Indians, trade with Spanish, 61-6.
- Archer, Branch Tanner (Dr.), in Philadelphia, 1836, 270; character, 279.
- Ardisson, Estevan, 115.

- Armesto, —, 29.
 Armistice between Texas and Mexico, 1843, Texan commissioners, 90, 194, 310-11, 422; discussion, 67-72, 82, 85-91, 193-4, 197, 311-12, 415, 419-20.
 Armstrong, John, 159-187 *passim*.
 Arricivita, Juan Domingo de (Fray), 325, 370-1.
 Arroyo de las Benditas Animas, identity, 328, 341; Aguayo's crossing, 328.
 Ashley, Robert, 155.
 Atais Indians, 338.
 Atascaneus Indians, 338.
 Atiasnogues Indians, 338.
 Attacapa Indians, 368.
 Attakapas post, 25.
 Austin, Moses, 263-4.
 Austin, Maria Brown (Mrs. Moses Austin), 262.
 Austin, Stephen Fuller, 262-78 *passim*; opposes Fredonian revolt, 232.
 Austin, William, 55.
 Austin, Mrs. William, 55.
 Austin College, 298, 303.
 Austin (City), 58; Indians near, 59-60; population, Oct., 1839, 60. (*See also* Presbyterian Church.)
Austin (Texas ship of war), 82.
Austin City Gazette, 215.
Austin Tribune, 429.
 Ayala, Lázaro de, 408, 411.
 Aynai Indians, *see* Hainai, 439.
 Ayres, —, 57.
 Azcárate, —, 224.
- Backus, —, 59.
 Badaraque, Thomas (Dr.), 274 note 32.
 Bahía, mission, 344; presidio, 352, 358-61, 412.
 Baily, — (of New Orleans), 50.
 Baily, James, 294-5.
 Baily family (of Houston), 295.
 Baker, Daniel (Rev.), 51; in Texas, 283-5, 293; connection with Austin College, 298; sketch of, 298-9.
 Baker, Moseley, 295, 302.
- Baños, Joachin de (Fray), connection with San Sabá mission, 391, 400-1; joint letter, extract, 401.
 Barclay, John, 274 note 32.
 Barnett, —, 59.
 Barnett, S. S., 48.
 Barney, Samuel, 115.
 Barnhart, J., 268.
 Barr, Murphy & Davenport, trading privileges, 158.
 Barrio, Pedro del (Governor), 268-9, 377; inspection, *May*, 1749, 376-7.
 Barrios y Jaúregui, Jacinto de (Governor), 385, 389, 412, 414; investigation, 1756, 389 note 6.
 Barrows, Solomon, 268.
 Bastrop, Baron de, land grant, 150.
 Bastrop (town), Indians near, 59.
 Baylor University, 303.
 Bayou Pierre, 7; settlement, 27-8, 159, 164, 168.
 Bee, — (Mrs.), 46.
 Bee family (of Houston), 295.
 Bell, — (Mrs. of West Columbia), 287-8, 297.
 Bell, Charles Keith, obituary, 100.
 Bell, Thaddeus, 288.
 Bell family (of West Columbia), 285; sketch, 287-8.
 Benedict, Harry Yandell, book review, 96-7.
 Beurnonville, —, 183.
 Bibliography: Citation and comment: Jefferson, *The Limits and bounds of Louisiana*, 9; Le Page du Pratz, *Histoire de la Louisiane*, 11, 173, 182; Folch, "Informe," 28-9 note 16; Wilkinson, "Reflections . . .", 28-32; *Western Presbyterian Herald*, 46, 55; *Alabama Journal*, 55; *New Orleans Observer*, 55-6; Chittenden, *American fur trade of the far west*, 61-3 *passim*; Thwaites, *Early western travels*, 63; Garrison, *Diplomatic correspondence . . .*, 67 note 2; *National Vindicator*, 71; *Boston Post*, 77; *New Orleans*

- Republican*, 77, 205; Gwin, *Memoirs . . .*, 103-5; Willey, *Transition period of California*, 108; *Star* (Los Angeles), 111-30 *passim*; *Alta California* (daily), 112, 119, 123, 128; *Courier and Enquirer* (New York), 117; *Journal* (Stockton, Cal.), 123; *Union* (Sacramento), 124, 126, 132, 134; Bancroft, *History of California . . .*, 124 note 54, 131-2; Guinn, *History of California*, 137-8; Royce, *California*, 137; Tuthill, *History of California*, 138; Carr, *Pioneer days in California*, 138; La Harpe, *Journal, 1699-1734*, 168; Monroe, *Journal, 1805*, 176, 179; Maps of Lopez and Delisle, 182; Arrowsmith's map of Mexico, 189; *New Orleans Commercial Bulletin*, 193; Yoakum, *History of Texas . . .*, Brown, *History of Texas*, 232 note 34; Foote, *Texas and the Texans . . .*, Bancroft . . ., *North Mexican States . . .* Garrison, *Texas . . .*, Barker, "Stephen F. Austin and the independence of Texas," Rather, "DeWitt's Colony", Howren, "Decree of April 6, 1830," 232 note 34; *Evening Post* (New York), *Albany Argus*, 265 note 3; *Philadelphia National Gazette*, 265-82 *passim*; *United States Gazette*, *National Intelligencer*, 277, 280; *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser*, 266-80 *passim*; *Boston Atlas*, 278; *New York American*, 278; Miller, "Historical Discourse," 283-4; map of Mugeses I., 306; McCaleb, *Obscure points . . .*, 324-5; Arricivita, *Crónica Seráfica . . .*, 325, 354-5 note 32; Bancroft, *North Mexican States and Texas . . .*, 325, 428; Shea, *Catholic church in colonial days . . .*, 325; Anda y Altamirano, *Memorial, August, 1749*, 359; Notes: Jefferson, *Limits and bounds of Louisiana*, 9-10; Hayes collection, 106 note 14; King's map, 151; pamphlet by "Silvestris," 171; *The Origin and true causes of the Texas insurrection, commenced in the year 1835*, 277 note 44; *A family of Millers and Stewarts*, 283 note 3; Minutes of Brazos Presbytery, 284; Allen's report on education (written for Wharton), 286, 302-3; Morfi, "Memorias," 324; Pichardo's map, 1811, 328; Espinosa, *Diario derrotero . . .*, 1716, 328 note 8; Anonymous commentary, Archives of Zacatecan College, 332; Espinosa, *Crónica Apostólica*, 337; Revilla Gigedo, decree, Feb. 14, 1747, 354-5 note 41; Revilla Gigedo, Despatch, July 17 or 27, 1747, 358-9 note 41; *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser*, 266-80 *passim*.
- Bidai Indians (Vidais), mission, 323-78; range, 333-4; attack upon San Sabá, 405.
- Bingham, —, 55.
- Bingham, — (Capt.), 296.
- Blackburn, Gideon (Dr.), 293.
- Blair, W. C. (Rev.), 58, 301.
- Blanc, —, 21.
- Blans, — (Comandant, Natchitoches), protest, 286 note 13.
- Boca de Leones, garrison, 346, 349, 352-3.
- Bocanegra, José María de, 249-51.
- Bolton, Herbert Eugene (Dr.), 321; *New light on Manuel Lisa and the Spanish fur trade*, 61-6; book review, 207-12; note, 216; *The founding of the missions on the San Gabriel River, 1745-1749*, 323-78.
- Book Reviews and notices: *Life of Thaddeus Stevens* (Woodburn), Lieutenant General . . . *Early* (Early), Dr. William Le Roy Broun (Brouns and Ordway), *General Laws of Texas*, 93-8; *Economic beginnings of the Far West* (Coman), *History of the German element in Texas . . .* (Tiling), 207-214; *The Viceroy of New*

- Spain* (Smith), *John Brown* . . .
 (Wilson), *L'Amérique Latine* (Garzon), 315-20; *Life of Robert Toombs* (Phillips), 430-1.
- Boone, Daniel, 31.
- Borden, Gail, 50, 56-7, 302.
- Boundary of Louisiana, western, 6-22, 169-87, 217-61.
- Boundary of Texas, eastern, 6-22, 169-87, 217-61; western, 75.
- Bowl ("Col. Bowles," Cherokee chief), 46.
- Bowman, William (Lieut.), 26.
- Boyle, William, 267 note 7.
- Brashears, Samuel, 272-3.
- Brazos Presbytery, early history, 283-5, 300-1.
- Brazos River, missions, 327; Aguayo's crossing, 328.
- Breckenridge, John, 14.
- Breckenridge, John (Rev. Dr.), in Houston, 1839, 288-9.
- Breckenridge, W. L. (Rev.), 50.
- Brenham, Richard F. (Dr.), 215.
- Brent, —, 48.
- Brent, J. L., 115.
- Brewster, —, 54.
- Brick, Samuel, 274 note 32.
- Briest, L. S., 272 note 29.
- Briggs, Isaac, 31 note 17, 140.
- Bringham, George H., 268.
- Broderick, David C., 126, 134.
- Brown, —, 54, 59.
- Brown, David Paul, 270-4.
- Brown, Joseph, 283 note 1.
- Brown, W. D., 268.
- Browne, —, 266.
- Brushy Creek, 60; identity, Aguayo's crossing, 328; Indians on, 344.
- Brutus* (Texan naval vessel) occupation of Cozumel Island, 190.
- Buckley, Eleanor, 215, 328 note 10.
- Buchanan, James, 275.
- Bullock, —, 293.
- Bullock's Hotel, 60, 285.
- Bunting, Thomas C. (Dr.), 271 note 23, 274 note 32.
- Burke, —, 127.
- Burke, James, 60, 283 note 1; 292-3, 302.
- Burke family (of Houston), 295.
- Burks, — (Dr.), 272 note 29.
- Burleson, Edward (Gen.), 44, 48, 60, 285, 294.
- Burnet, David G., 278-9, 290, 294.
- Burr, Aaron, 168, 264.
- Burrow, — (Capt.), 268.
- Bustillo y Zevallos, Juan (Governor), 334 note 2; campaign, 1732, 328; memorial, extracts, synopsis, 331-4, 347-50, rebuttal, 350-2; services, 347.
- Butler, Anthony, letters, extracts, 253, 260; mission to Mexico, 257-60.
- Butler, Z. (Rev.), 57.
- Caddo, Caddodacho, *see* Kadohadacho, 155, 157-8, 161, 163-4, 332.
- Caddo trace, 150.
- Cadodachos, establishment, 349, 351.
- Cadena, Asencio (Corporal), 405-6, 411.
- Caldwell, — (Rev.), 57.
- California, division, movement for, 101-39.
- Calleja, Felix (Mariscal de campo), 163.
- Camacho, —, diplomatic negotiations, 230.
- Camarillo, Juan, 115.
- Camino Real (San Antonio Road), 329.
- Campbell, — (Rev.), 46.
- Campmeeting, Rutersville, 1839, 59, 293, 304.
- Canary Islands, colonists from, 328.
- Concepes Indians, 338.
- Cances Indians, 161.
- Candelaria (mission), founding, 1749, 375-6.
- Cannon, Newton (Gov.), 282.
- Cañedo, —, 246, 248.
- Caoco, *see* Coco, 334.
- Capitol, Austin, 294.

- Carancaguases, see Karankawa, 348 note 13.
- Carnes, Henry, 115.
- Carothers, W., 265.
- Carpenter, Miles N., 273, 274 notes 32-3.
- Carr, —, 274 note 33.
- Carr, J. H. (Dr.), 272 note 29.
- Carr, James Henry, 273, 274 note 33.
- Carrillo, —, 103-4.
- Carrillo, Anastasio, 115.
- Carrillo, Joaquin, 115.
- Carrillo, José Antonio, 115.
- Carrillo, P. C., 115.
- Casablanca (Lipan chief), 399.
- Casa Calvo, Marqués de, connection with the Louisiana-Texas frontier question, 1-44, 144-68 *passim*.
- Casados Indians, 157.
- Casañas, —, 332.
- Casa Yrujo, Marqués de, connection with the Louisiana-Texas frontier question, 17-24, 144-80 *passim*.
- Casos Indians, 338.
- Castellanos, Francisco Xavier (Fray), 370, 376; letters, extracts, 371-2.
- Ceballos, Ciriaco (Capt.), 21.
- Cerralvo (presidio), 346, 348, 351-3.
- Cevallos y Guerra, Pedro de, 21-4, 145-85 *passim*.
- Chamberlain, — (Rev.), 57.
- Champlain, Juan Bautista (Jean Baptiste Champlin), 63, 65.
- Chandler, Joseph R., 273.
- Chapman, — (Rev.), 295.
- Chapman, R. E., 28-9 note 16.
- Charleston Library Society, 99.
- Chase, — (Rev.), 57-8.
- Cherokee Indians, 232.
- El Chico (Lipan chief), 398-9, 400.
- Chirinos, Luis, 411.
- Choctaw Indians, 165-7.
- Chouteau, Pierre, 148.
- Chriesman's, 284; schoolhouse, 285, 301.
- Civilian and Galveston City Gazette*, 55, 71, 301.
- Claiborne, William Charles Cole (Governor), relation to Louisiana-Texas frontier question, 1-42, 140-87 *passim*.
- Clark, — (Rev.), 59, 294.
- Clark, Daniel, relation to Texas-Louisiana frontier question, 1-42 *passim*.
- Clark, Thomas C., 271 note 23.
- Clay, Henry, diplomatic negotiations, 223-47 *passim*; letters, extracts, 223-4, 233-6, 243.
- Clement, Arthur H., 266.
- Clermont Hotel, temperance meeting, 287.
- Coahuila, presidio, 353; governor, 413.
- Coahuiltecan Indians, 326.
- Coan family (of Houston), 295.
- Cocke, Stephen F. (Rev.), 284.
- Coco Indians, mission on San Xavier River, 323-78; habitat, tribal affinity, 334.
- Coigly, —, 200.
- Coleman family, massacre of, 59.
- Columbia* (steamer), 54, 57.
- Comanche Indians, 53, 155, 161, 224, 248, 263, 282; treaty, 1838, 49; tribal and Spanish relations, 380, 399; reduction hoped for, 382; attack upon San Sabá, 402-14.
- Come Cavallos Indians, 392.
- Come Nopales Indians, 392.
- Concepción, (mission), 330, 343, 394; founding, 347 note 7.
- Concord, post, 25.
- Connell, John, 267 note 7.
- Conner, Charles W., 267 note 7.
- Conrad, John, 270 note 19, 271 note 23.
- Conrad, Robert, 270.
- Conrad, Robert C., 271, note 23.
- Conrad, Robert T., 270 note 19.
- Constitutional Convention, California, 1849, 103-5.
- Consulate, British, Corpus Christi Bay, 306.
- Convention, Southern California, 1851, 114-16, 120; resolution, extract, 116.

- Converse, S., 75, 77-8, 80-1, 83.
 Cooke, S. F., *error for Cocke*, Stephen F., *q. v.*
 Copeland, George, 268.
 Copes, J. Wilson (Dr.), 287.
 Copes, Mrs. J. Wilson, 287-8.
 Cordero, Antonio de (Governor), 159.
 Coronel, A. F., 115.
Correo (schooner), 53, 56, 304.
Correspondence from the British Archives concerning Texas, 1837-1846 (Adams), 67-92, 188-206, 306-14, 415-27.
 Cortina, J. N., 428.
 Cos, Martin Perfecto de (Gen.), capture, 1836, 52.
 Cosby, —, 129.
 Cotton, production, capacity of Texas, 309.
 Cousate, *see* Koasati, 158.
 Coutts, Cave C., 115.
 Cox, Isaac Joslin, *The Louisiana-Texas frontier*, 1-42, 140-87.
 Coyle, Hugo, 146.
 Cozumel Island, sketch map, 188; history and description, 188-92; grants, 194.
 Crabb, —, 119.
 Cramayel, — de, 76.
 Cranes, Charles N., 268.
 Creigh, Alfred, 265 note 3.
 Cross Timbers, Indians near, 331.
 Crozat, Antoine, grant to, 10, 180.
 Crozier, R. H. (Rev. Dr.), obituary, 215.
 Cruger & Moore, 301.
 Cujanes Indians, 348 note 13; Spanish relations, 359.
 Cullen, Ezekiel W., 58, 286, 303.
 Cummings, William, 266.
 Curd, John W., obituary, 216.
 Dallas, George M., 273.
Dallas Democrat, 428.
Dallas News, 429.
 Dart, Christopher, slave trade, 199-200.
 Davenport, — (Mrs.), 56.
 Davenport, Samuel, 33, 37, 41, 165; trading privileges, 155-6.
 Deadoses Indians (Agdocas, Aquodoces, Yacdocos, Yadosa, de Adozes, Doxxa), mission, 323-78; racial affinity, habitat, decrease, 329, 333-4, 348.
 Davenport, Sarah, *see* Randall, Sarah Davenport, 49.
 Davis, —, 287.
 Davis, — (Dr.), 304.
 Davis, William, 270 note 19; 274 note 32.
 Dayton, Jonathan, 14.
 Dearborn, Henry A., 160, 165, 167; letter, extract, 162, 165.
 Decrés, —, 10-11.
 Dedrick, George, letter, extract, 267.
 Delano, — (Miss), 287.
 Derringer, Henry, 271 notes 23 and 26.
 Desauque, F. J. (Capt.), 267.
 DeSoto, Hernando, expedition, 1539-41, 264.
 Doby, —, 45.
 Dolores y Viana, Maria Ano Francisco de los (Fray), missionary service, 1733-41, 334-5; connection with San Xavier missions, 335-78; letters, extracts, 337, 341, 342-3 note 32, 377; connection with San Sabá mission, 382-98.
 Dottery's (settlement), 59.
 Douglas, —, 127-8.
 Douglas, Stephen Arnold, 107, 109.
 Doxxa, *see* Deadoses.
 Doyle, Percy W., 71, 83, 193, 196, 307-8, 310, 422 note 5, 423; letters, 67-8; letters to, 69-74, 84-5, 88-92, 196-7, 311-13, 424-7.
 Draper, A. C. (Dr.), 274.
 Driggs, Mary W. (Mrs.), *see* Rhoades, Mary W., 44.
 Dudley, James G., obituary, 429.
 Duforet, —, 159.
 Duke, B., 270 note 19.
 Dukes, Thomas W., 272 note 28.
 Dunbar, William (Sir), connection with

- Louisiana frontier matters, 1-42 *passim*; expedition, 1804, 141-54.
- Duncalf, Frederic (Dr.), 215.
- Duncan, Benjamin, 273 note 31.
- Duncan, John, 268.
- Dunn, William Edward, 215; book reviews, 315-18, 320; *The Apache mission on the San Sabá River: its founding and failure*, 379-414.
- Du Rivage, —, 332.
- Dwight, Timothy (Dr.), 57.
- Eastman, E. O., 56.
- Ecores de Fabri, 150.
- Education in the Republic of Texas, 286, 298, 302-3.
- Edwards, Hayden, Fredonian revolt, 232-4.
- Edwards, Munroe, slave trade, 199-200.
- Elguezabal, Juan Bautista (Gov.), 145-6.
- Eliza Russell*, claims, 307 note 4.
- Ellicott, Andrew, explorations, 142.
- Elliott, Charles, letters to, 67-8, 77-82, 193, 306, 310, 425; letters, 68-76, 80-5, 88-92, 194-7, 307-13, 415-27.
- Elliott, Jacob, 268.
- Ellison, William Henry, *The Movement for state division in California, 1849-1860*, 101-39.
- Encroachment, French, 341-2, 351, 359-61, 386.
- English, William, 270 note 19.
- Eppelsheimer, William, 274 note 32.
- Erving, —, 154.
- Escandón, José de, Conde de la Sierragorda, expedition, 1746-ff., 352-4, 361-2 note 47.
- Espinosa, Isidro Félix (Fray), 332, 337, 352; letter, 361-2 note 47.
- Espíritu Santo (mission), 395; transfer, 347 note 7.
- Evans, Britton (Col.), 269, 272.
- Evans, Napoleon B., 271 note 23.
- Ewing, George, 268.
- Exall, Henry (Col.), death, 428.
- Eyesh Indians (Ais, Ayish), 157.
- Fannin, James W., Jr. (Col.), 266-7.
- Felter, Daniel, 270 note 19.
- Ferrell, W. C., 115, 127.
- Fisher, Samuel Rhoads, 269.
- Fitler, Daniel, 273 note 31, 274 note 32.
- Fitzgerald, —, 59.
- Flag, British, alleged Mexican insult to, 423-7.
- Fleming, —, 266.
- Flirt* (American war schooner), 421.
- Florence, Thomas B., 271 note 23.
- Floridas, American negotiation for 1-42, 170-87 *passim*; importance, 3, 4, 23-4, 30-2; American occupation, 220.
- Folch, Vizente, 24, 167; intrigue with Wilkinson, 28-32.
- Foote, Henry Stuart, 108-9, 283 note 1.
- Ford, John S., 428.
- "The Forest" (Dunbar's plantation), 149.
- Fort Miro (Washita post), 26, 150.
- Foster, N. C., 270 note 19, 272-3.
- The founding of the mission on the San Gabriel River* (Bolton), 323-78.
- Fowler, Littleton (Rev.), 45-6, 48, 292.
- Franciscans: College at Querétaro: missions on San Xavier River, 323-78; on San Sabá River, 279-414: College at Zacatecas: missions, 328, jealousy of Querétarans, 364; College of San Fernando, missions, 346, 379-414.
- Frazier, — (Rev.), 58, 297, 299.
- Fredonian War, 232-4, 247.
- Freedmen, laws of Texas regarding, 203-4.
- Freeman, — (Lt. Col.), 151.
- French, trade, 349, 351; alleged complicity in attack upon San Sabá, 414.
- Frick, John H., 271 note 26.
- Friend* (steamboat), 43, 49.
- Friendship* (steamer), 304.
- Fritz, Peter (Maj.), 270-1.
- Frontier, Texas-Louisiana, 1-42, 140-87.
- Fugitive slaves, 39-42.
- Fullenwider, — (Rev.), 284.
- Fuller's, 284-5.
- Fur trade, Spanish, 61-6.

- Gaines, Edmund Pendleton (Gen.), conduct in Eastern Texas, 1836, 274, 282.
- Gallatin, Albert, 13, 16.
- Galban, Juan (Galván, Lieut.), 362, 365-6, 412; expedition, 1745, 383.
- Galveston, 43, 56-7; real estate values, 1838, 302.
- Galveston Island, 298, 386-7.
- Galveston News*, 429.
- Gano, R. M. (Gen.), obituary, 99.
- Ganzábal, Juan Joseph (Fray), connection with San Xavier missions, 365-6, 376.
- Garcia, Diego Martin (Fray), service, 370.
- Garcia, Joaquin, 411.
- Garcia, Joseph, 407-8, 411.
- Garcia, Larios, Francisco (Governor), opinion, 360-2.
- General de Kalb* (American schooner), 269.
- Geotes Indians, 338.
- German, J. L., obituary, 99-100.
- Gidding, Giles A., 268.
- Gifford, P. L., 194.
- Gilland, George W., 266-7.
- Gillespie, —, 142-3.
- Gillies, Theodore (Capt.), 271 notes 23 and 26, 273, 274 notes 32-3, 280.
- Glascock, —, 59.
- Glathery, Erastus M., 271 note 23.
- Godney, L. A., 270 note 19, 271 note 20.
- Godoy, Manuel de ("Prince of Peace"), 174-85 *passim*.
- Goliad, massacre, Pennsylvania victims, 267.
- Goodwin, John D. (Gen.), 270 note 19, 274 note 32.
- Graham, —, 119.
- Graham, David R., 272 note 28.
- Grant, B., 272 note 29.
- Grant, James (Col.), 268.
- Grappe, —, 161.
- Grappe, François, 152, 161, 164-5.
- Grass Fight, 268.
- Gravina, —, 170, 173.
- Gray, A. C., obituary, 700.
- Gray, Mrs. Fairfax, 292.
- Gray, W. Fairfax, 44.
- Gray family (of Houston), 295.
- Grayson, Peter W., 43.
- Green, Daniel, 274 note 32.
- Green, Thomas J., 424.
- Grimarest, Pedro, 41, 166-7.
- Groce, —, 304.
- Groce, Leonard, 286.
- Gross, Charles, 266.
- Grover, Thomas D., 270 note 19, 273 note 31.
- Guadalupe River, settlement, 411.
- Guapites Indians, 348 note 13.
- Guerra, A. M. de la, 115.
- Guinn, J. M., 137.
- Gulick, —, 57.
- Gutierrez, Enrique, 408, 411.
- Gutierrez, Juan Antonio, 410-11.
- Gutierrez, Octaviano, 115.
- Gutierrez de Lara, José Bernardo, revolutionary movements, 248-50.
- Gwin, William M., 126, 137; party, 138.
- Haff, — (Miss), 56.
- Haighler, L. S., 272 note 29.
- Hainai Indians (Aynai), village, 349.
- Hall, W. W. (Rev.), 283, 292, 297.
- Hall, Warren, D. C., 55.
- Hall, Willis, 270.
- Hamilton, — (Rev.), 297.
- Hanie, — (Dr.), 59.
- Hanna, James, 273 note 31.
- Harazthy, Agostín, 111, 115.
- Hardin family, 247.
- Harriet* (schooner), 200.
- Harrisburg & Brazos Railroad, 295 note 16.
- Hasinai Indians (Asinai), missions, 326; intertribal relations, 332-3; tribes, 339.
- Hawkesbury, Charles Jenkinson, first Earl of, 13.
- Hay, Peter, 271 note 26, 273 note 31.
- Hayes, Benjamin (Judge), 106 note 14.

- Haynie, — (Dr.), 293.
 Hearn, V. W., 115.
 Hemphill, John, 273 note 31.
 Henderson, —, 59.
 Henderson, I. J. (Rev.), 57.
 Henderson, Thomas, 57.
 Hensal, George W., 268.
 Hernandez, Juan (Fray), 370-1.
 Herrera, Simon de (Gen.), 174.
 Hierbipiame Indians (Erviapiame), mission, 323-78; at Rancheria Grande, 329-30.
 Hill, — (Rev.), 59.
 Hill, G. W., letter, 86-8.
 Hill, Roscoe R., 28-9 note 16.
 Hill family, 285.
 Hinkle, Charles, 271 note 23.
 Hiscas Indians, 338.
 Hockley, George W. (Col.), 90-1, 295-6, 310.
 Hodges, John L., 273 note 31.
 Hoes, — (Rev. Dr.), 58.
 Holland, Benjamin H. (Capt.), 266.
 Holloway, —, 266.
 Holman, — (Rev.), 50-1, 57, 297.
 Hoover, Leonce, 115.
 Hot Springs of the Washita, exploration, 149-51.
 House, Edward M., 98.
 House, John, 155.
 Houston, Sam, 44-6, 54, 67, 71, 86, 91, 196, 266-81, *passim*, 298, 304; Indian policy, addresses, comment, 45, 48; arrangement respecting armistice, 69-70, 72, 82, 419-20; Mexican policy, 73-4, 84-5, 415-20; letter, extract, 74-5; temperance speech, 1839, comment, 289; attitude toward annexation, 415-20.
 Houston (city), cemetery, 55.
 Hubbs, —, 124.
 Hughes, William F., 270 note 19.
 Humboldt, Frederick Heinrich Alexander, Baron von, 16.
 Humphries, — (Misses), 44, 46.
 Hunt, Jefferson, 115, 126-8.
 Hunt, Memucan (Gen.), 50, 54, 287.
 Hunter, —, 26, 147, 149, 151.
 Hunter, George (Dr.), expedition with Dunbar, 142-54.
 Hurst, Stephen D. (Col.), 267.
 Hutchins, —, explorations, 142.
 Hutchison, — (Rev.), 300.
 Hutchisson, Robert, 268.
 Igodosa, *see* Deadoses.
 Indians, policy regarding, Spanish 41-2, American 41-2, 162-7, Houston's, 45-48; Texas-Louisiana frontier: border relations, numbers, 1804-5, 154-169; presents for, 156-8, 381 note 3, 391-2, 400; in missions, life, 377; Northern: tribal relations, 399, 413, attack upon San Sabá establishment, 402-14; council on Upper Trinity, 1843, 196; of Southern United States, 31.
 Internal Provinces, defensive policy, 28.
Invincible (Texan naval vessel) seizure of Cozumel I., 190.
 Iturbide, Agustín de, 224-6; fall, 219.
 Iturrigaray, José de (Viceroy), 144, 168.
 Jackson, Andrew, 282; views upon Texas, 220, 253; letter, extracts, 253.
 Jarden, —, 274 note 32.
 Jarden, Jacob, 274 note 32.
 Jarden, John, 274 note 32.
 Jefferson, Thomas, relation to Louisiana frontier question, 1-42, 142-87 *passim*; letters, extracts, 15, 140-2.
 Jetur, — (Rev.), 297.
Johannes (schooner), 43, 303.
 Johnson, Francis W., 268.
 Johnson, William, 266.
 Johnson, William C., 270 note 19.
 Joliet, Louis, exploration, 182.
 Jones, Anson, 48, 54, 69, 74-5, 84, 304, 421.
 Jones, George W., 270 note 19.
 Jones, Levi (Dr.), 296, 302; sketch of, 286-7.

- Jones, Mrs. Levi, 287, 296.
 Jones, Lewis, *error for* Jones, Levi, 296.
 Jordan, John, 270 note 19, 273.
 Joutel, Henri, 331.
 Jumano Indians (Jumanes), 349.
 Juntas, 1803, 20-21; Mexico, *Feb.* 27, 1756, 385-7, 390.
- Kadolhadacho Indians, 155, 157-8, 161, 163-4, 332.
 Karankawa Indians, 334, 348 note 3; mission, 327; tribes, 338-9, 348.
 Kaufman, David S., 298.
 Kennedy, John M., 273 note 31.
 Kennedy, William, letters, 188-95, 197-8, 204-6, 306-7, 313-14, 423.
 Kennicott, —, 56.
 Kerr, Gabriel, 273 note 31.
 Kerr, William P., 268.
 Kichai Indians (Keechi, etc.), mission, 323-78.
 King, Junius B. (Rev.), 57; ordination, 296-7.
 King, Rufus, 9 note 5, 13.
 King, Nicholas, 151.
 Koasati Indians, 158.
 Koehler, Thomas, 271 note 23.
 Kolb settlement, 323-4.
- Lacopseles Indians, mission, 323-78.
 Lafargue, Juan Bautista (Jean Baptiste), 63, 65.
 Laffite, Jean, survivor, 291.
 Lake Jackson, 55.
 Lamar, Mirabeau Buonaparte, 44-5, 298, 425; election, *Sept.* 3, 1838, 56; cavalry corps, 267.
 Langerheimmer, William, 268.
 LaSalle, René Robert Cavelier, Sieur de, 8, 10, 14, 182, 264.
 Latham, Milton S., elected U. S. Senator, 134; message, comment, extract, 135-6.
 Laura (steamer), 54.
 Laurence, — (Capt.), 268.
- Laussat, Pierre Antoine, relation to Louisiana boundary, 1-24 *passim*, 169-70.
 Lawrence, A. (Rev.), 298.
 Leadbetter, John, Jr., 271 note 23.
 League, —, (of League, Andrews & Co.), emancipation scheme, 204-5.
 Lee, C. V. R., 115.
 Legislature of California, 1852-60, state division question before, 117-37.
 Leman, John, 268.
 Leonard, Gilbert, statement, 157 note 8.
 Linkey, William, 271 note 23.
 Lewis, John A., 115.
 Lewis, Meriwether, expedition with Clark, 16, 19, 24, 31, 42, 140-2, 144, 154.
 Lewis, W. J., 268.
 Linkey, William, 271 note 23.
 Lipan Apaches, 392, 398; country, 329.
 Lisa, Manuel (fur trader), letter, 65-6; translation, 63-4; comment, 61-3.
Little Penn, claims, 422 note 3.
 Little River, Aguayo's crossing, 328.
 Livingston, Edward, 170-2; claim to West Florida, 11-12.
 Lockwood, —, 272 note 29.
 El Loco, settlement, 349, 351.
 Long, James, 264.
 Looscan, Adele Briscoe (Mrs. Michael Looscan), 98.
 Los Angeles (Cal.), meeting, *Feb.* 10, 1850, 105; meeting, *Sept.* 12, 1851, resolutions, extract, 114.
 Lott, —, 121.
 Loughridge, —, 59.
The Louisiana-Texas frontier (Cox), 1-42, 140-87.
 Love, James (Col.), 291, 302.
 Lubbock, Francis Richard ("Mr. L."), 45, 290.
 Lybrand, C. D., 270 note 20.
 Lybrand, Charles D., 271 note 23.
- McBride, P. H., 268.

- McCaleb, Walter Flavius (Dr.), 324-5.
 McCalla, W. L. (Rev.), 298.
 McCorkle, — (Rev.), 285.
 McCormick, — (Rev.), 57.
 McCormick family, 285.
 McCrea, William H., 274 note 32.
 McCullough, John, 57-8.
 McCullough, John (Rev.), 304; in Texas, 283-5, 292, 300.
 McDougall, — (Gov. Cal.), message, 1852, extract, comment, 117-19.
 McFarland, John, 285, 300.
 McKinney & Williams, 302.
 McLeary, James H. (Judge), 428.
 McLeod, Hugh (Gen.), 423-5; letter, 425.
 McMichael, Martin, 270 note 19.
 McMullen, R. B. (Rev.), 50, 56.
 McNally, —, 268.
 McNealus, Virginia Quitman, 428.
 Madison, James, 157-60, 167; relation to Louisiana frontier matters, 1-25 *passim*, 172-4; controversy, 154.
 Magee, Augustus, 264.
 Mahan, P. Jenks, 268 note 10.
 Maison Rouge, Marquis de, land grant, 150.
 Mallet, Island of, 150.
 Manderson, John, 270 note 19.
 Manning, William Ray, *Texas and the boundary issue, 1822-1829*, 217-61.
 Marbois, —, 170.
 Markham, R. Jenks, 268.
 Marqués, Francisco Xavier (Fray), connection with San Xavier mission plans, 346, 357.
 Marquette, Jacques, 182.
 Martin, — (Rev.), 297.
 Martin, Robert C., 271 note 23.
 Martin, Thomas, 268.
 Martinez, José, 7-8, 18, 22.
 Matagorda, garrison, 159, 165-8.
Matagorda Bulletin, 301 note 26.
 Matamoros, prisoners, Pennsylvanians, 268.
 Mater, — (Rev.), 57.
 Matthews, — (snipmaster), 269.
 Maurese, William, 274.
 Mayeye Indians, mission for (San Xavier River), 323-78; habitat, 329, 331-2, 348; decrease, 334.
 Mediation, British, between Texas and Mexico, 78, 417-21.
 Mediavilla y Ascona, Joaquin de (Gov.), 333; services, opinion, 350-2.
 Meghy Indians, identity, 331.
 Merry, Anthony, 13, 174 note 17, 178.
 Mescalero Apaches, 392.
 Mexican prisoners, 197.
 Mezières, Athanase de, 22.
 Mier, expedition, 424, 427; prisoners, 71, 85.
 Mifflin, Benjamin, 273 note 31.
 Miller, James Weston (Dr.), 283-4.
 Millett, — (of Houston), 295.
 Milon, — (Madam), 43.
 Mines, San Sabá country, 382-3.
 Minor, Juan, reconnoissance, 145-6.
 Minor, Stephen, connection with Texas-Louisiana frontier question, 144-8.
 Miranda, Bernardo de (Fray), expedition, 1755, 383.
 Missions, San Xavier River, 323-78; Rio Grande, 326; San Antonio, 263, 326, 330-1, 334-5, 343-4, 347 note 7, 358-9, 369, 371, 376, 381, 390, 392, 394, 398, 412; Matagorda Bay, Trinity River, 327; San Sabá River, 263, 379-414.
 Mississippi Valley Historical Association, 99.
Mississippi Valley Historical Review, 99, 321.
 Missouri Compromise line, 109-10.
 Missouri Fur Company, 64-5.
 Mitchell, —, 13.
 "Mobile Act," 14, 166, 177.
 Moffatt, —, 274.
 Moffatt, T. R., 271 note 26.
 Molina, Miguel (Fray), connection with San Sabá mission, 403, 405-6, 410.
 Monclova, presidio, 352, 412.

- Monroe, James, relation to Louisiana frontier matters, 11-33 *passim*; special mission to Spain, 169-87.
- Monte Grande, *see* Cross Timbers.
- Monterey (Cal.), capture, 1846, 102.
- Montgomery, John C., 273 note 31.
- Montoya, —, 251.
- Moore, Edwin Ward (Commodore), 71, 73, 287; letter, extract, 190.
- Moore, Francis W., Jr., *see* Cruger & Moore.
- Morehead, — (Gen.), expedition into Mexico, 117.
- Morris, Inage, 425.
- Morris, Robert, 270 notes 19-20, 271 note 26.
- The movement for state division in California, 1849-1860* (Ellison), 101-39.
- Moro, —, 200.
- Moyer, John, 268.
- Mugeres Island, 194-5, 306; description, 189-90.
- Murphy, Edward, 157 note 8, 165.
- Murphy, William, trading privilege, 155-8.
- Murphy, William S., 308, 421.
- Murray, Robert G., 429.
- Musselman, Robert, 268.
- Myres, —, 121.
- Myres, Michael, 268.
- Nabedache Indians, village, 349.
- Nacogdoches, 33; status, 1803, 26; defence, 31; arrivals, 1804, 159; Spanish force at, 1805, 164-7; mission, 364.
- Naglee, John, 270 note 19, 273 note 31.
- Naguides Indians (Naudis), 338-9.
- Nall, — (Rev.), 57, 297.
- Nall, — (Mrs.), 297.
- Nandaco Indians, 7.
- Nanderson, Andrew, 270 note 19.
- Natajés Apaches, 392.
- Natchitoches, 18-20, 34-6, 40-1, 154, 167, 180; post, 25-7; conditions, 1804, 153; fortification, 168.
- Navarro, Antonio, 423, 425.
- Navy Yard, Galveston, 41, 50, 287.
- Naylor, Charles, 270, 272, 273 note 31.
- Neal, Joseph C., 271 notes 23 and 26.
- Neil, Robert, 268.
- Neutral zone, proposed, 15-16, 21.
- Newell, — (Mrs.), 56.
- Newell, Stuart, 270, 273-4.
- Newman, D., 271.
- Newman, Daniel, 272 note 26.
- Newman, S., 270 note 20.
- New Orleans Greys, 266-7.
- Newspapers of Texas, 55, 71, 215, 301-2.
- Nicknames, pseudonyms, initials, given names: A. (Dr.), 54; B., 47; C. (Miss), 55; C. (Mrs.), 296; G. (Dr.), 54; H., 59, 296; L., 50; M., 48; Nicolas, 410; Silvestris, 17; W. (Col. and Mrs.), 295-6.
- Noble, John H., 265 note 3.
- Nolan, Philip, 155, 264.
- Nootka Sound convention, 7.
- Norton, George, 270 note 20.
- Nueces River, missions, 327.
- Nuestra Señora de los Dolores del Rio de San Xavier, *see* San Francisco Xavier.
- Nuevo Leon, 412-13; Bishop, visit to — Natchitoches, 1804, 150-4, 167.
- Obregon, — (Mexican minister to the United States), mission, 221-43 *passim*.
- O'Campo, Francisco, 115.
- Ogier, I. S. K., 115.
- Olivares, Antonio de (? Fray), 332.
- Onis, Luis de, 218; *Memorias* . . . quoted, 218.
- Opelousas, post, 25.
- Oran, J. M., obituary, 429.
- Orcoquiza Indians, 365; numbers, range, etc., 361.
- Orejone Indians, 378.
- Orleans Territory, 15.
- Ormond, —, 158.
- Orobio Bazterra, Joaquin de (Gov.), expedition, 1745, 321-2, 361-2; opinion, 360-1.
- Orr, John, 68 note 6.

- Ortega, Antonio Marfa, 115.
 Ortega, Joaquin, 115.
 Ortiz, Francisco Xavier (Fray), 334
 note 2; connection with San Xavier
 missions, 335-78 *passim*.
 Osage Indians, 148.
 Owen, Clark, 46, 296.
 Owen, James, 46.
 Owen, Robert, memorial, extract and
 comment, 245-6.
 Packenham, Richard, 70-1.
 Pajalaches Indians, 378.
 Pakwan Indians, 326.
 Palliet, John B. T., 37.
 Panis Indians, *see* Pawnee, 157.
 Parage de las Animas, 344.
 Paredes, Miguel de (Fray), quoted, 331.
 Parkinson, W. B., 265 note 3.
 Parrilla, Diego Ortiz de (Capt.), serv-
 ice, 389; jurisdiction at San Sabá,
 389; career at San Sabá, 390-412; let-
 ter, extract, 399.
 Pastates Indians, 338.
 Patterson, Robert (Gen.), 270 note 19.
 Patton family, 285.
 Pawnee Indians, 157-8.
 Peace Pipe ceremony, 49.
 Pearson, T. K. (Capt.), 267.
 Pelones Apaches, 392.
 Pennington, Mrs. R. E., 215.
Pennsylvania and the independence of
Texas (Winston), 262-82.
 Peraza, — (Col.), 191.
 Perkins, S. H., 270 note 20.
 Peters, William, 268.
 Pickering, Timothy, 13-14.
 Pico, Andrés, 132; resolutions, comment,
 129-31.
 Pinckney, Charles, mission to Madrid,
 17-34, 160-85 *passim*; recall, 169.
 Pitts, William (Capt.), obituary, 216.
 Pleasanton, A. J., 271 note 23.
 Poinsett, Joel Roberts, mission to Mex-
 ico, 1825-9, 223-59; letters, extracts,
 227-8, 231, 234, 238, 240-3.
 Population of Texas, 1832, 199; 1837,
 199; 1840, 198-9; 1843, 198.
 Postal charges, 1838, 50.
Potomac (war brig), 49, 287.
 Presbyterian church in Texas, organiza-
 tion, early history: Houston, 283-5,
 292, 294; Austin, 60, 283-5, 293-4,
 304; Columbia, 284; Galveston, 284;
 San Augustine, 294; Independence,
 294.
 Prisoners, release discussed: Texan, 194;
 Mexican, 196.
 Pruned, Eusebio, 344, 357.
 La Punta (Lampazos), mission, 337
 344-5.
 Quises Indians (Quitseis), 338.
 Rábago y Therán, Pedro de (Coman-
 dante), expedition, 1755, 383-4; con-
 nection with San Sabá missions,
 384-6, 388-9.
 Rábago y Therán, Phelipe (Capt.), sus-
 pension, 384.
 Railroad meeting, first in Texas, 295.
 Rainey, Frank (Dr.), obituary, 429.
 Ralls, — (Rev.), 46.
 Ramón, Diego, expedition, 1707, 330; ex-
 pedition, 1716, 327-8, 330.
 Ramsay, — (Capt.), 269.
 Ramsay, R. D., 268.
 Ramsdell, Charles William, book re-
 views, 93-6, 318-20, 430-1.
 Ramsey, Alexander, 271.
 Ranchería Grande, mission for (San
 Xavier River), 323-78; tribes, loca-
 tion, history, 329-34, 348, 365-6.
 Randall, John T., 49.
 Randall, Sarah Davenport (Mrs. John
 T.), 49.
 Randolph, John, of Roanoke, 14.
 Real, Julius, 98.
 Recognition of Texan independence, by
 Mexico, 307-9, 416-19.
 Red, William Stuart (Rev.), editor,
 ... *Diary of ... Allen*, 43-60; *Al-*


- len's reminiscences of Texas, 1838-1842*, 283-305.
 Red River, American occupation, 2; navigation by Americans, 21; projected exploration, 142-51; description cited, 152-3; missions, 327.
 Reed, James, 271 note 26.
 Reed, Samuel F., 273 note 31.
 Reeve, M. M. (Dr.), 274 note 32.
 Reid, —, 59.
 Reid, Hugo, 115.
 Remmey, Henry, 271 note 23.
 Revillagigedo, Conde de (41st Viceroy), 385.
 Rhoades, E. A., 44, 296.
 Rhoades, Mary W. (Mrs. E. A. Rhoades), 44, 296.
 Riddle, Joseph P., 267.
 Riley, J. S., 270 note 20.
 Riley family (of Houston), 295.
 Rio Grande (presidio), 412.
 Rivera, Pedro, inspection, 1727, 332, 350.
 Robertson, James Alexander, 28 note 15.
 Robin, C. C., 21-2, 26.
 Robinson, — (U. S. consul at Tampico), 190.
 Robinson, —, 295.
 Robinson, Tod, 302.
 Robinson family (of Houston), 295.
 Rocafuerte, —, 245.
 Rockdale, missions near, 323-78, 383-4.
 Rock Dam, 323-4.
 Rodriguez, Juan (chief, Ranchería Grande), 330.
 Rogers, —, 135.
 Rogers (Cherokee half-breed), 48.
 Ronaldson, James, 273 note 31.
 Rose, Pleasant W. (Dr.), 55.
 Roshler, George (Col.), 270 note 19.
 Royce, Josiah, 137.
 Rudolph, S. P., 270 note 19.
 Rusk, Thomas J., 298.
 Russell, Frederick, 115.
 Russell, William J., 55.
 Russell, Mrs. William J., 55.
 Ruttersville College, 303.
 Rutter, Adolphus A., 269.
 Sacramento (presidio), 347, 349, 351-3, 360.
 Saint Bernard Bay, *see* San Barnardo Bay, 7, 9-10, 182.
 St. Catherine's Landing, 149, 151.
 St. Cyr, Laurent Gouvion, 10.
 St. Denis, Louis Juchereau de, 21, 264; expedition, 1716, 327-8.
 Salcedo, Juan Manuel de, relation to Texas-Louisiana boundary question, 10-25 *passim*, 157.
 Salcedo, Nemesio de (Comandante General), relation to Texas-Louisiana frontier question, 18-42, 145-68 *passim*; letter, extract, 163.
 Saligny, Alphonse de, 192, 306-7.
 Sample, David, 268.
 San Andrés River, identity, 327.
 San Antonio, siege, 1835, Pennsylvanians in, 268.
 San Antonio de Béxar (presidio), 346, 354, 359, 362, 390.
 San Antonio de Valero (mission), 330, 335, 343-4, 346, 371, 376, 392, 394, 398; founding, 347 note 7.
San Antonio Express, 428.
 San Antonio Road (Camino Real), 328 note 8, 329; plans for marking, 428.
 San Barnardo Bay (Saint Bernard), 7, 9-10; La Salle's colony, 182.
 Sánchez, Thomás, 115.
 Sanders, —, 156.
 Sanderson, —, 49.
 San Diego (Cal.), meeting, *Aug. 30, 1851*, resolutions, extract, 113.
 San Felipe de Austin, 59.
 San Fernando de Béxar, factions, 328.
 San Francisco de la Espada (mission), founding, 347 note 7.
 San Francisco Solano (mission), transfer, 1718, 347 note 7.
 San Francisco Xavier (mission), founding, *Feb., 1848*, 365-6.

- San Gabriel River, name, 327. (*See also* San Xavier River.)
- Sanguinet, Carlos (Charles), 61, 64-6.
- San Ildefonso (mission), founding, *Feb.*, 1749, 373-5.
- San Jacinto, battle, 52, 280-1.
- San Jacinto*, 56.
- San Juan Bautista (mission), apostates, 330.
- San Juan Capistrano (mission), founding, 347.
- San Luis Advocate*, 302.
- San Marcos River (Colorado), mission company's camp on, 395-8.
- San Patricio, settlements, 75.
- San Pedro de los Nabadaches (village), 349, 351.
- San Sabá (mission), history, 347 note 7, 379-414.
- San Sabá (presidio, San Luis de las Amarillas), 397, 401; attack upon, 402-14.
- San Sabá River, mission on, history, 379-414.
- Santa Ana, Benito Fernandez de (Fray), connection with San Xavier mission, 369-71, 373-6; letters, extracts, 369-72; connection with San Sabá missions, 381-3.
- Santa Anna, Antonio López de (Gen.), 70, 82, 85, 89-91, 197, 265, 308, 311; revolutionary schemes, capture at San Jacinto, 51-2; agreement and arrangements respecting armistice, 67-8, 88.
- Santa Fé, expedition, 86-7, 425; traders, 195.
- Santa Rosa del Sacramento (presidio), 347, 349, 412.
- Santiestaben, Joseph (Fray), connection with San Sabá missions, 391, 401, 404-5; death, 408-9, 411; burial, 411.
- Santissima Trinidad, Francisco de la (Fray), connection with San Xavier mission plans, 357, 359; connection with San Sabá mission, 393-6, 401, 403.
- San Xavier (presidio), garrison, 390.
- San Xavier de Gigedo, presidia and missions, 399.
- San Xavier de Nájera (mission), history, 330.
- San Xavier River (San Gabriel), Spanish establishment, 323-78, 383-4; transfer to San Sabá, 384-6, 388-97; identity, 327; Aguayo's crossing, 328.
- Sayopines Indians, 378.
- Schooll, J. D., 268.
- Schuler, John J., 265 note 3.
- Scott, John, 268.
- Seylla* (British sloop), 68-9, 83-4, 196, 306.
- Serosse, Joseph S., 271 note 26.
- Servers, Foster, 268.
- Servoss, Charles K., 271 note 23, 273, 274 note 32.
- Shabas, —, 167.
- Sharpe, —, 54.
- Sheldon, — (Gen.), 55.
- Sibley, John (Dr.), 6 note 2, 28, 35-6; appointments, 152, 160-4; information from, 152-3, 155-6, 161, 163, 167-8; activity, 165-6.
- Sierra, Phelipe de (Cavo), 377.
- Skipwith, Fulwar, 172, 177, 183, 186.
- Slavery: bearing upon Louisiana-Texas frontier relations, 3; upon state division movement in California, 1849-60, 101-39 *passim*; upon Texas revolution, recognition, etc., 276-9, 309, 312.
- Slaves: alleged Spanish attempts to alienate, 37-9, 41; numbers, Texas, 1832, 199; 1837, 199; 1840, 198, 1843, 198, 205; laws regarding, 201-4; treatment, health, 202; increase, 202-3; manumission, 203.
- Slave-trade, Texas, 199-201, 312.
- Sloan, James, 271 note 23.
- Sloat, John Drake, 102.
- Smith, —, 266.
- Smith, Ashbel (Dr.), 429.
- Smith, Erasmus ("Deaf"), capture of Cos, 52.

- Smith, Henry (?), 265 note 3.
 Smith, John T., 268.
 Smith, Thomas S., 270 note 19.
 Smith, W. P. (Col.), 270 notes 19-20.
 Smith's Hotel (Bullock's), 60.
 Snell, Martin K., 267 note 7.
 Snyder, —, 121.
El Sol, 234, 258.
 Someruelos, Marqués de (Capt. Gen.), 28, 30.
 South, George W., 271 note 23.
 Spraggins, — ("Daddy"), 54.
 Sprogell, Marshall, 270 note 19.
 Stanley, Norris, 273 note 31.
 Steedman, S. H., 265 note 3.
 Steele, —, 272 note 29.
 Stephens, William, 271 note 23.
 Stephenson, — (Capt.), 268.
 Stewart, Hamilton, 301.
 Stille, — (Capt.), 165.
 Stille, — (of Philadelphia), 298.
 Stout, Francis, 273.
 Stout, Francis H., 273.
 Stubblefield, —, 54.
 Stumph, John F., 270 note 19.
 Sullivan, — (Rev.), 59.
 Sunday school, Houston, 1838, 48-9, 55, 285, 294-5.
 Sutherland, T. W., 115.
 Swift, John (Col.), 270 note 19, 273.
- Taensa Indians, 157.
 Taguacana, Tahuacanes, *see* Tawakoni.
 Taguayos, Taovaya, Toboso, *see* Tawehash.
 Talleyrand, Périgord, Charles Maurice de, Prince de Benevento, suggestion, 12; diplomatic intrigue, 169-86 *passim*.
 Tamique Indians, mission, 327.
 Tampico expedition, Pennsylvanians in, 266-7.
 Tancagues, *see* Tonkawa.
 Tanico Indians, 338-9.
 Tarr, Augustus D., 270 note 19.
 Tarr, E. D., 270 note 19.
 Tawakoni Indians, 166; mission, 323-78.
- Tawehash Indians, 164, 339, 349; chief, 413.
 Taylor, Zachary, 102, 107.
 Tejas Indians, 336, 349-51; intertribal and Spanish relations, 380; attack upon San Sabá, 402-14.
Telegraph and Texas Register, 301.
 Temperance meetings, 1839, Galveston, 287; Houston, 288-9.
 Tenzos, *see* Taensa, 157.
 Terán, Manuel de Mier y (Gen.), boundary commissioner, 239, 249.
 Terreros, Alonso Giraldo de (Fray), connection with the San Xavier missions, 336-7, 350-1, 370-1; Apache mission, 1754, 382; connection with San Sabá mission, 382, 387-8, 391-411.
 Terreros, Pedro Romero de, assumes expense of San Sabá missions, 387-8, 394, 401-2.
 Texas, occupation, 1689, motive, 380 note 1; name, application, 349.
Texas and the boundary issue (Manning), 217-61.
 Texas Emigration Company of Philadelphia, 269.
Texas Presbyterian, 43-4 note 1, 283-302 *passim*.
 Texas Rifle Brigade, 267.
 Texas State Historical Association, affairs, constitution, 432-4.
 Thomas, Evan M. (Lieut.), 267.
 Thompson, Jacob, 110.
 Thompson, John (Col.), 270 notes 19-20, 271 note 26, 273 note 31.
 Thompson, Waddy, 73, 417.
 Thompson, Wells, obituary, 429.
 Thornton, —, 55.
 Thornton, — (Lieut.), 267.
 Thruston, A. (Col.), 269.
 Thurston, John, 266.
 Tibbets, G. P., 115.
 Tlascaltecan Indians, connection with San Sabá mission, 391.
 Tod, John G. (Lieut.), 45.

- Tonkawa Indians, 338-9; treaty, 1838, 45; description, visit to Houston, 1838, 53; missions, 323-78, 383-4; attack upon San Sabá, 405.
- Tonty, Henri de, 22.
- Torrens, —, mission to the United States, 219-20, 222-3; letters, extracts, 219-21.
- Town, Thomas B., 271 note 23, 274 note 32.
- Trade, contraband, 23, 27, 32, 72; Indian, 16, 157, 161, 163, 349, 351, 355, 357-8, 360-1; of Texas, foreign, 310, 313-14, Mexican, 422.
- Travel, 1839, 303-4.
- Treaties, conventions, etc.: citation and comment: U. S.-Spain, 1795, 41; France-Spain, 1800 (San Ildefonso), 10, 18; United States-France, 1803, 13; U. S.-Spain, 1819, 217-40 *passim*; U. S.-Mexico, 1828, 217-61 *passim*; Texan-Tonkawa, 1838, 45; Texan-Comanche, 1838, 49.
- Trinity River missions, 327.
- Trudeau, Felix, 165.
- Tups Indians, 338.
- Turner, Edwin (Capt.), 26-7, 153, 155-9, 165-6.
- Turreau, Louis Marie, 169, 172-4.
- Ugarte, José Joaquín (comandante), 27, 145-6, 164.
- Underwood, — (Judge), 43.
- University of Texas, 298.
- Upshur, Abel Parker, 415-17.
- Urrea, José (Gen.), 266.
- Urrutia, Thoribio de (Captain), 336, 342, 368, 412; action regarding San Xavier missions, 357.
- Valle, Dionisio (comandante), order, 164.
- Valle, Ignacio del, 105, 115.
- Van Buren, Martin, diplomatic negotiations, 250-7; instructions, extracts, 254-7, 259.
- Van Zandt, Isaac, despatch, synopsis, 415-17.
- Varela, Benito (Fray), connection with San Sabá mission, 397, 400.
- Vasquez, Joseph, 409-10.
- Vedoya, Pedro (fiscal), opinion, 346-7.
- Vial, Pedro (Pierre), expeditions, 62.
- Victor, Claude Perrin (General); instructions to, 10-11, 170.
- Victoria, Guadalupe (Gen.), 225, 234.
- Victoria, mission near, founding, 347 note 7.
- Vidai, *see* Bidai.
- Vidal, Felix (Comandante), 155.
- Villareal, Andrés de, 405, 407, 411.
- Vogdes, William, 271 note 23.
- Volunteer Army of Texas, Third Regiment, Company A, 268 note 11.
- Volunteers from the United States: Pennsylvania, 262-9.
- Voluntine, —, 266.
- Walker, John, 142-3, 145; survey, 153.
- Walker, John K., 270 note 19.
- Walker, John R., 273 note 31.
- Ward, Thomas William ("Col. W."), 45.
- Wardlaw, — (Mrs.), *see* Jones, Mrs. Levi, 287.
- Washita (post), 25-6.
- Washita River, explorations, 148-9; population, 149-50; land grants on, 150.
- Webb, James, family, 59.
- Webster, — (Mrs.), 293.
- Webster party, murder, 293.
- Welschmeyer, —, 304.
- Welschmeyer, John G., 45.
- West, James, 267.
- Westbrook, John B., 268.
- Wharton, John (son of W. H.), 286.
- Wharton, John A., 58, 302; death, 286, 302-3.
- Wharton, William H., 48, 54-5, 58, 298; character, 279, 286; in Philadelphia, 1836, 270; death, 286; speech at Bible Society, comment, 286-7.
- Wharton, Mrs. William H., 54, 286.
- Wharton family, 286, 298.

- Wharton* (Texas ship of war), 83.
 Whiaker, Frances A. (Whitaker?), 268.
 Whig Party in California, 1852, 124 note 54.
 Whitaker, Thomas, 266.
 White, William, 271.
 White, William, Jr., 271 note 23.
 White Hairs (Osage chief), 148.
 Whitehurst, —, 59.
 Whiting, — (Maj.), 290.
 Whiting, — (Miss), marriage, 290.
 Whiting, Samuel, 302.
 Wilkinson, James, 14, 16, 17, 20, 24-5, 165, 264; Spanish intrigues, 28-32, 174; letters, extracts, 165, 168.
 Williams, John A., 98.
 Williams, Samuel M., 90-1, 310; (*See also* McKinney & Williams.)
 Williamson, — (Sergeant-major), 266.
 Williamson, Jesse, 272 note 28.
 Wilson, B. D., 115.
 Wilson, Hugh (Rev.), 285, 300.
 Winchester, — (Rev.), 57.
 Winkler, Ernest William (State Librarian), book review, 212.
 Winston, James E., *Pennsylvania and the independence of Texas*, 262-82.
 Wintuisen, Phelipe (Governor), expedition, 1741, 335.
 Withersoop, Thomas, 56.
 Witherspoon, — (Rev.), 297.
 Wolf, John G., 270 note 19.
 Woll, Adrian (Gen.), 91, 194, 422; letter, 85-6; letter to, 96-8.
 Wood, J. D., 269.
 Wood, Joseph, 271 note 26.
 Wood, Mandred, 267 note 7.
 Wood, William, 270 note 19.
 Woodburn, James Albert, 93.
 Woodman, James (Col.), 274 note 32.
 Woodruff, —, 44, 60, 295, 300-1.
 Wright, Edward B. (Rev. Dr.), obituary, 428.
 Wright, R. W. W., 56.
 Xarame Indians, mission, 327, 341-2 note 29.
 Ximénes, Diego (Fray), 337; connection with San Sabá missions, 391, 400-1; letter (extract), 401.
 Yacdocas Yadosa, *see* Deadoses.
 Yatasse settlement, 7.
 Yates, — (Prof.), 43.
 Yates, A. J., 75-6, 83; letters, 77-82; letter to, 80-1.
 Yellow fever, Galveston, Houston, 1839, 285, 294, 304.
 Yojuane Indians (Yujuanes), mission, 323-78; racial affinity, range, decrease, 329, 332-4, 348; attack upon San Sabá, 402-14.
 Yucatán, 195; Texan expedition to, 72-3; troubles, 1843, 82.
 Yzazmendi, Pedro (Fray), survey, 377.
 Yucatán, negotiation for sale of vacant lands, 191, 194.
 Zanesville Volunteer Rifle Company, Pennsylvanians in, 268.
 Zantzinger, —, 272 note 29.
 Zavala, Lorenzo de, 51.
 Zozaya, — (Mexican minister to the United States), 217-18; letter, extract, 219.
 Zuber, W. P., obituary, 215.



F
381
S65
v.17

The Southwestern historical
quarterly

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY
